

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07097046 2

CARSWELL Co., Limited
Bookbinders,
PRINTERS,
LAW BOOKS,
1 TORONTO





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE

DUBLIN REVIEW.

VOL. CXIII.

JULY—OCTOBER 1893.

LONDON :

BURNS & OATES, LIMITED. J. DONOVAN, 19 HENRIETTA STREET, W.C.

DUBLIN : M. H. GILL & SON.

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI & CHICAGO : BENZIGER BROTHERS.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

THE

DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY 1893.

ART. I.—BISHOP LIGHTFOOT AND THE EARLY ROMAN SEE.

1. *The Apostolic Fathers.* Part I.—S. Clement of Rome. A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations. By J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Bishop of Durham. Two volumes. London: Macmillan & Co. 1890.
2. *The Apostolic Fathers.* Part II.—S. Ignatius. S. Polycarp. Three volumes. Second Edition. 1889.
3. *Essays on the Work entitled Supernatural Religion.* Reprinted from *The Contemporary Review.* 1889.
4. *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age.* Reprinted from Editions of St. Paul's Epistles. 1892.

THE reader of the following pages must not look for any general account or criticism of the massive volumes named at the head of this article, which have been styled by Bishop Lightfoot's fellow-worker for many years, and successor at Durham, "a monument of learning, sagacity, and judgment, unsurpassed in the present age." *

The object in view is something much less ambitious. We are all familiar with works in which the historical evidence for the Primacy of St. Peter and the Roman See is marshalled

* Bishop Westcott's Prefatory Note to S. Clement.
[No. 7 of Fourth Series.]

with a cogency that appears to us irresistible, and nowhere more forcibly than in the luminous treatise *De Ecclesia* which forms the third volume of Dr. Schanz's *Apology*; and we are apt to wonder how it is that the evidence does not appeal to fair-minded Protestants with the like force. Now Bishop Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers* gives evidence, to use Bishop Westcott's words, of "an exhaustive study of the chief records of the history of the Roman Church to the third century;" his learning, his thoroughness, and his robust common sense are admitted on all hands, his honesty of purpose and fair-mindedness are transparent. It must then be instructive and in many ways useful for us to know precisely the impression made upon a mind of this calibre by the body of evidence which seems to us so satisfactory.

There is another reason why it is well that we should study in Bishop Lightfoot's pages the question of the Early Roman See. For the past half-century and more there has existed in Germany a rationalistic school which has busied itself above all with early Christian documents and history. It need hardly be said that Bishop Lightfoot had little sympathy with the "feverish and restless criticism" of this school; yet he recognises the fact that in various ways the interests of Truth have been served by the attack. "All diligent students of early Christian history," he says, "must have derived the greatest advantage on special points from the conscientious research, and frequently also from the acute analysis, even of writers of the most extreme school;"* and elsewhere: "The destructive criticism of the last half-century is, I think, fast spending its force. In its excessive ambition it has o'erleapt itself. It has not, indeed, been without its use. It has led to a thorough examination and sifting of ancient documents. It has exploded not a few errors and discovered or established not a few truths."[†]

In this way it has come to pass that some of the old Protestant strongholds have been rendered untenable. The German critics were for the most part hostile, or at least indifferent to Christianity itself, and were unencumbered by doctrinal proclivities and so were able to express an unbiased

* "Essays on Supernatural Religion," p. 141.

† "Ign. and Polyc.," i. pref. xv.

verdict on various points debated between the Church and the Sects during the past three hundred years. Now Bishop Lightfoot was thoroughly conversant with the methods and writings of this school ; we shall therefore be able from his works to gauge how far the controversial position of Anglicans towards the Church in regard to the particular claims of the Roman See has been modified for them by the results of recent research.

The purpose then of these pages is to bring together and codify the views on the Early Roman See to be found scattered throughout Bishop Lightfoot's works, and thus to show precisely to what points of difference the question has in his opinion been narrowed.

There is a certain pathos in this investigation ; for the subject is the last one that engaged the veteran scholar's attention, and the last words he ever wrote, only three days before his death, form part of an imperfect sentence in a fragment of an essay on *Saint Peter in Rome*. So far as it goes this fragmentary essay will be of first importance in the inquiry before us ; but it has to be supplemented from many parts of his works.

To begin then with those points in which Bishop Lightfoot most nearly agrees with Catholic writers.

I. On turning to the essay on *Saint Peter in Rome* we find that it opens with the recognition of a primacy in St. Peter ; and on proceeding further we find that arguments often brought forward against it appear to the author no longer tenable.

Even a cursory glance [he says] at the history of the Apostles, so far as it appears in the Gospel records, reveals a certain primacy of St. Peter among the twelve. He holds the first place in all the lists ; he has a precedence of responsibility and of temptation ; he sets the example of moral courage and of moral lapse. Above all he receives special pastoral charges.*

Our author bases this proposition on the usual Petrine texts ; but Matthew xvi. 18, "Thou art Cephas and upon this rock will I build My Church," is the only one he discusses at any length. He points out that some few Fathers interpret the rock of Christ Himself ; but the vast majority understand

* "Clem. Rom.," ii. 481.

it of St. Peter, in some sense. That the rock is St. Peter and not our Lord seems to the author certain. He puts the case thus :

An essential difference lies at the root of the two explanations. We are fain to ask, Is Christ the rock, or is Peter the rock, on which the Church is built (however we may explain the latter alternative)? Now there are two arguments which mainly weigh with those who explain the rock of Christ, (1) the one from the etymology, (2) the other from the imagery.

He goes on to show that neither of these arguments is valid, and that therefore "our only guide is the logical connection of the passage. But here there can be little doubt that the sense points not to Christ the speaker, but to Peter the person addressed, as the rock."*

The question still remains open in what sense St. Peter was the rock. To this we shall have to return when discussing points of difference. But in the midst of all explanations and refinings the fact stands out regarding St. Peter's position — "But still it is a primacy, a pre-eminence."†

II. Bishop Lightfoot next discusses the Roman visit of St. Peter. His judgment on this point is thus summed up :

Reasons exist—to my mind conclusive reasons—for postulating a visit of St. Peter to Rome on which occasion he suffered martyrdom there. If these reasons are not each singly decisive, the combination yields a body of proof, which it is difficult to resist.‡

III. The discoveries and researches of recent years have made it necessary for all who wish to keep abreast of the advance of historical science, to withdraw to a great extent from the old Protestant position regarding the Church of Rome at the close of the first century. The Roman Church of A.D. 95 appears to Bishop Lightfoot as "the most prominent Church of Christendom," and "the most important Church in Christendom."§ And after commenting on the fact that in St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians his own name does not occur, Dr. Lightfoot says :

This being so, it is the more instructive to observe the urgent and almost imperious tone which the Romans adopt in addressing their

* "Clem. Rom.," ii. 485, 486.

‡ *Ibid.* ii. 491.

† *Ibid.* ii. 487.

§ *Ibid.* i. 58, 61.

Corinthian brethren during the closing years of the first century. . . . It may perhaps seem strange to describe this noble remonstrance as the first step towards papal domination, and yet undoubtedly this is the case.*

And elsewhere :

It is strenuous, even peremptory, in the authoritative tone it assumes.†

St. Ignatius's letter to the Romans was in Bishop Lightfoot's opinion written some fifteen years after that of St. Clement to the Corinthians—*i.e.*, about A.D. 110. In his comment on the Inscription we think we notice a certain wavering; but the final conclusion seems to be that in it St. Ignatius assigns “a pre-eminence of rank,” “a primacy,” to the Roman Church. The various passages will be found in the note below.‡ As for the *potentior principalitas* of St. Irenæus, Bishop Lightfoot is quite clear that it points, even more strongly than St. Ignatius' words, to “a certain precedence” of the Church of Rome over the other churches of Christendom.§

* “Clem. Rom.,” i. 69, 70.

† “Ign. and Polyc.,” i. 398.

‡ St. Ignatius addresses the Roman Church as the one which “προκάθηται ἐν τῷ περιφερειαὶ τοῦ Ρωμαίων”—“hath the presidency in the country of the region of the Romans.” In the note on this passage Bishop Lightfoot points out that the words allow of a twofold interpretation: they may describe (1) “the limits over which the supremacy or jurisdiction extends,” and so would only mean that the Church of Rome was the principal church in the district about Rome; or (2) “not the range of the supremacy, but the locality of the supreme power itself,” and in this case the expression would assign a certain precedence to the Church of Rome over the other churches of Christendom (“Ign. and Polyc.,” ii. 190, 191). The author on the whole declares in favour of the first interpretation, and we think the reasons he brings forward perhaps entitle him to do so; and we notice that Dr. Schanz does not appeal to this text. Zahn, however, is quite clear that “regionibus omnibus, que sub Romanorum erant ditionem, ecclesia Romana quodammodo præsidere dicitur” (“Patr. Apost. Op. ed. Gebhardt-Harnack-Zahn,” Fasc. ii. 57). Harnack is still stronger: “However much we may abate all extravagant expressions in his Letter to the Romans, so much is evident, that Ignatius marked out the Roman community as the President among the sister communities, and that an energetic activity of this community in supporting and instructing the other communities was familiar to him.” (“Dogmengeschichte,” i. 404.) And it is instructive to find that after all Bishop Lightfoot cannot divest himself of the feeling that this is the sense of the words, for on the next page, commenting on the similar expression—“προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης,” he refers back, saying, “The Church of Rome, as it is first in rank, is first also in love.” Elsewhere he says the passage “assigns to this Church a pre-eminence of rank as well as of love” (“Ign. and Polyc.,” i. 398), and in yet another place he says, without any limitation, that in it St. Ignatius “assigns a primacy to Rome” (“Clem. Rom.,” i. 71). There can, therefore, be little question as to Bishop Lightfoot's predominant feeling about the meaning of the words, or the interpretation to which he finally gravitated.

§ “Ign. and Polyc.,” ii. 191.

It is worthy of note that Bishop Lightfoot attaches no ordinary importance to St. Irenæus as a witness of Christian belief in the second century. He taxes the author of *Supernatural Religion* with regarding the "testimony of Irenæus as the isolated opinion of an individual writer," and of being "unconscious of the historical background which it implies." "He was connected directly with the Apostles and the Apostolic age by two distinct personal links, if not more." "His testimony must be regarded as directly representing three churches at least"—Asia Minor, Rome, and Gaul. Thus "he is backed by a whole phalanx of past and contemporaneous authority."*

About A.D. 190 Victor became Bishop of Rome. In Bishop Lightfoot's eyes he was the first Pope. He writes:

There is all the difference in the world between the attitude of Rome towards other churches at the close of the first century, when the Romans as a community remonstrate on terms of equality [? cf. "urgent and almost imperious tone," "strenuous even peremptory," "authoritative tone," above] with the Corinthians on their irregularities, strong only in the righteousness of their cause, and feeling, as they had a right to feel, that these counsels of peace were the dictation of the Holy Spirit, and its attitude at the close of the second century, when Victor the bishop excommunicates the churches of Asia Minor for clinging to a usage in regard to the celebration of Easter which had been handed down to them from the Apostles, and thus foments instead of healing dissensions. Even this second stage has carried the power of Rome only a very small step in advance towards the assumptions of a Hildebrand or an Innocent or a Boniface, or even of a Leo; but it is nevertheless a decided step.†

And more strongly elsewhere: Victor was

the first who advanced those claims to universal dominion which his successors in later ages have always consistently and often successfully maintained. . . . At the end of the first century the Roman Church was swayed by the mild and peaceful counsels of the presbyter-bishop Clement; the close of the second witnessed the autocratic pretensions of the haughty Pope Victor, the prototype of a Hildebrand or an Innocent.‡

* "Essays on Supernatural Religion," 264-268.

† "Clem. Rom.," i. 70.

‡ "Dissertations," 186. Bishop Lightfoot's remarks on Pope Victor naturally suggest to the historical mind thoughts which we shall put in Harnack's words: "How could Victor have ventured on issuing such an edict (powerless though he was to enforce it universally) if it were not established and recognised that to fix the conditions of the common unity in decisive questions of faith belonged chiefly to the Roman Church? How could Victor have made such an unheard-of demand on autonomous communities, if he as Roman

In the course of another half-century (A.D. 250), these "pretensions" had made such way that Rome was now "the most powerful Church in Christendom."* At this time a collision occurred on the question of re-baptism between St. Cyprian and the Pope ; we give, without comment, Bishop Lightfoot's presentment of the episode :

Stephen, inheriting the haughty temper and aggressive policy of his earlier predecessor Victor, excommunicated those who differed from the Roman usage in this matter. These arrogant assumptions were directly met by Cyprian. He summoned first one and then another synod of African bishops, who declared in his favour. He had on his side also the Churches of Asia Minor, which had been included in Stephen's edict of excommunication. Thus the bolt hurled by Stephen fell innocuous, and the Churches of Africa and Asia retained their practice.

Here was a combination calculated to reduce the Roman bishops to their proper level—a combination having at its head all the enormous personal influence of St. Cyprian, "the first prelate whose force of character vibrated throughout the whole of Christendom." And what was the sequel ? "At a later period indeed Rome carried the victory" ;† her episcopate continued "the most renowned and powerful in the world."‡

Our investigation so far has revealed the fact that three points regarding the early Roman See appear to Bishop Lightfoot to be clear :—

(1) That a primacy among the Apostles was conferred by our Lord on St. Peter.

(2) That St. Peter visited Rome and was martyred there.

(3) That at the end of the first century the Roman Church held a primacy over all other churches—a primacy which ever grew and developed as the ages ran on.

The importance of the recognition of these propositions by a scholar of the author's calibre—"sobrii judicii vir ac doctrina exquisita pollens" (Zahn)—can hardly be over-estimated. As compared with the past, they are the high-water mark in this direction of safe Church of England opinion ; but the fact must not be overlooked that this point once reached by such a critic,

bishop were not recognised as in a special sense the guardian of that common unity ?" ("Dogmengeschichte," i. 408.)

* "Dissertations," 206.

† *Ibid.* 205, 207.

‡ "Clem. Rom.," i. 98.

is not unlikely to become the low-water mark at no distant date.

We have seen that Bishop Lightfoot does accept a primacy in St. Peter, his personal connection with the Roman Church, and the recognised pre-eminence of that Church at the close of the first century. These are unquestionably approaches which naturally lead up to Catholic teaching. We must now turn our attention to those limitations which form a barrier to progress in that direction. These may be reduced to three heads, each attaching to one of the three points of agreement:—

(1) St. Peter's primacy was temporary, and ceased with the admission of the Gentiles into the Church.

(2) Though in Rome, St. Peter was never Bishop of Rome.

(3) The primacy of the Roman Church was not originally due to any primacy of her bishops, but to other causes; and the later primacy of the Bishop of Rome grew out of the early primacy of his Church.

It must needs be a great advantage to have a clear idea of the reasons which withheld Bishop Lightfoot from accepting the Catholic position when he had gone so far towards it; and also to see what case so learned and accomplished a scholar could make out against that position. Surely the cause will hardly find a better advocate. To preclude all chance of an unfair or inadequate presentment of Bishop Lightfoot's argument, we shall quote his words at some length, for it is proper that such a writer should be allowed to exhibit the whole strength of his case himself.

I. St. Peter's primacy was temporary, and ceased with the admission of the Gentiles into the Church.

In order to clear the way for the establishment of this theory, the text—"Thou art Cephas, &c."—which, as we have seen, conferred a primacy upon St. Peter, has first to be disposed of. Bishop Lightfoot observes that "patristic interpretations of the earliest and last ages are mainly twofold." The first is that the rock is Christ Himself. But this interpretation, as stated above, he rejects in favour of the one that "the rock is connected with St. Peter, being either his confession, or his faith, or some other moral or spiritual qualification, capable of being shared by others." He adds: "The most explicit declaration of it is found in the typical passage of

Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* [xvi. 13], tom. xii. § 10,"—“where nothing could be fuller or more explicit than the language.”*

Here it is well to recall the point on which the discussion immediately turns—viz., on what the Church is built; and also, for the sake of clearness, to fix what we all understand by “The Church” here spoken of. It is something concrete and external. It is the body of faithful men that passes under the name of “the Church of Christ.”

As the passage of Origen stands in Bishop Lightfoot’s pages, there is nothing to suggest that Origen has in mind something different from this. But on turning to Origen himself, it appears that certain omissions, which are indeed indicated, quite alter the meaning of the passage, and, in fact, make it irrelevant to the present discussion.

The extract from Origen is long, but as the matter is of importance from more than one point of view, and the passage has done yeoman’s service in controversy, it is necessary to tax the reader’s patience so far. The parts omitted in Bishop Lightfoot are printed in italics.

But if we also, like Peter, say, “Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God,” flesh and blood not having revealed it to us, but the Spirit from heaven having illumined our heart, we become a Peter, and it would be said to us by the Word, “Thou art Peter” and so forth. For every disciple of Christ is a rock, from whom all they that partake of the spiritual rock which follows did drink; and upon every such rock the whole doctrine of the Church, and the polity in accordance therewith is built;† *for the Church a-building by God is in each one of the perfect, haring the assemblage of things that fill up the blessedness of words and deeds and thoughts.* But if thou supposest that the whole Church is built by God on that one Peter alone, what wouldst thou say concerning John the Son of Thunder, or any one of the Apostles? otherwise shall we dare to say that against Peter especially the gates of hell shall not prevail, but that they shall prevail against the remaining Apostles *and the perfect?* *Is not then what has been said before “The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it” (applicable) to all and each one of them; and also the saying “On this rock I will build my church?”* Are then the keys of the Kingdom

* “*Clem. Rom.*” ii. 482–484.

† ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς πᾶς λόγος καὶ ἡ κατ’ αὐτὸν πολιτεία. We allow the translation given by Bishop Lightfoot to stand in the text, but we observe that it runs counter to the whole drift of Origen himself, and is certainly incorrect. Huet has much more nearly caught the meaning by his “omnis sermo ecclesiasticus et vitae juxta ipsum institutæ ratio;”—“Every churchly thought or utterance, and a mode of life in accordance therewith.” “Churchly,” that is in the sense in which Origen goes on to explain this “church.”

of Heaven given by the Lord to Peter alone, and shall none other of the blessed [Bishop Lightfoot's text has here "blessed Apostles;" "Apostles" is not in the Greek] receive them? But if that saying "I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven" is common to others also, surely what precedes and what is subjoined as having been said to Peter is (also common). For there the words seem to have been said as if to Peter, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven," &c.* But in the gospel of John, the Saviour, when giving the Holy Spirit to the disciples by breathing on them, says, "Receive the Holy Ghost," &c. Many, therefore, shall say to the Saviour, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God," but not all who say this will say it to Him having learned it in no way through revelation by flesh and blood, but the Father Himself, who is in heaven, having removed the veil that lay upon their heart; in order that, after this, having gazed with face unveiled upon the glory of the Lord, they may say in the spirit of God, of Him: "The Lord Jesus;" and to Him: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." And if any one saith this to Him, flesh and blood not revealing it, but the Father which is in heaven, he shall obtain the promises [Greek: the things which have been said], as the letter of the gospel says, to that particular Peter, but as the spirit teaches, to every one who becomes like that Peter. For all become namesakes of the rock who are imitators of Christ, the spiritual rock following those who are being saved, that they may drink out of it the spiritual drink. These, like Christ, are called after the rock; furthermore being members of Christ, deriving their name from Him, they were called Christians; and (as members) of the rock, Peters. Starting from this, you will say that the just are called just from the justice of Christ, and the wise from the wisdom of Christ, and similarly you will make surnames for the saints after His other names. And to all such as this, the saying would be said by the Saviour, "Thou art Peter," and so forth, as far as "shall not prevail against it." What is "it?" Is it the rock on which Christ builds His church; or the Church itself, for the expression is ambiguous; or the rock and the Church, being one and the same thing?

Here Bishop Lightfoot stops; but it is proper to continue the quotation until Origen has worked out his thought and passed on to something else.

* The danger of making doctrinal deductions from Origen's interpretations when he is in a mystic mood is shown by a comparison of tom. xiii. in Matt. § 31, where he bases an argument for a great difference, *πολλὴν διαφορὰν καὶ ὑπεροχὴν*, in regard to the power of the keys between St. Peter and *τοὺς δευτέρους*—which the context shows is everybody else—on the ground that these same words, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," apply to St. Peter alone, *ἰδιὰ*. The passage in question also throws light on the notion of the Church built by God being in each of the perfect, and every such perfect one being a rock on which the Church is built; for in the same line of speculation he makes a limited power of the keys a possession of every Christian who thrice admonishes his brother but in vain, the fulness of power belonging to St. Peter alone.

*This, I think, hits off the truth ; for the gates of hell shall neither prevail against the rock on which Christ builds the Church, nor against the Church; as is written in Proverbs, “the path of a snake over a rock cannot be found.” But if the gates of hell shall prevail against any one, such an one would be neither a rock on which Christ builds the Church, nor (would he be) the Church a-building by Christ on the rock. For the rock is impassable for a snake, and it is stronger than the gates of hell striving against it ; so that on account of its strength the gates of hell do not prevail against it ; and the Church, as the building of Christ, who built His house wisely on the rock, does not admit of the gates of hell, which prevail against every man who is outside the rock and the Church, but have no power against it. Having observed that every one of the sins through which it is possible to go down to hell, is a gate of hell, we shall understand that the soul having spot or wrinkle or any thing of the sort, and which on account of its wickedness is neither holy nor blameless, is neither a rock on which Christ builds, nor a church, nor part of a church, which Christ builds on the rock.**

As it stands in Bishop Lightfoot's pages, the passage is, we admit, effective for his purpose ; but on reading it in its entirety we soon perceive that the Church which Origen has in mind is not the congregation of the faithful, the Kingdom of God on earth, but that other Kingdom of God spoken of by our Lord when he said, “The Kingdom of God is within you.” It is the reign of grace in the individual soul. With this clue the passage, however obscure it may seem at first sight, is clear enough ; and although in the course of it Origen almost loses himself in the maze of his own metaphors, yet even through this he works round again to the idea from which he started.

The fact is, that the passage on which such stress has been laid, is wholly irrelevant in the controversy in which it is employed, and its use is a simple *ignoratio clenchi*.

Moreover, so far from being a “typical passage” from any point of view, we may well ask, can its fellow be found in the whole range of patristic literature; nay, so far as doctrinal considerations are involved, it is not typical even of Origen himself.†

* Origen, “Comm. in Matt.,” tom. xii. §§ 10, 11, 12.

† We hasten to add that we are satisfied Bishop Lightfoot had nothing to do with its preparation in the form in which it appears in his pages. This part of his work was written just before his death, and he was unable to revise it ; it is quite clear that in his draft he must have taken the passage directly from some controversial book ready at hand. In accordance with his usual mode of work, on revision he would have verified the passage, and doubtless would have seen how carefully Origen's real thought had been eliminated

We have dwelt on this stage of our inquiry, because the turn of Bishop Lightfoot's argument lies in this quotation; and the others, notably the one from St. Cyprian, are of no serious force, this one put aside.

Now to dismiss shortly the question of patristic interpretations of the Rock. Bishop Lightfoot goes on to say that with the exception of those few who understand it of Christ the Rock, St. Peter's confession, or faith, or firmness "is with some modification the universal interpretation of the Fathers for many centuries."* And unquestionably this interpretation is a common one from St. Hilary onwards. But we think a third interpretation should have been mentioned, which can hardly be regarded as a mere "modification," viz., that St. Peter himself is the rock. This is the earlier interpretation, being found currently in Origen, Tertullian and Cyprian; and it always continued the more common one. Often both are given by the same Father; and indeed a moment's thought is enough to show that they are not mutually exclusive.

So much for the patristic side of this discussion; and we must add that Bishop Lightfoot's treatment of the Fathers seems to us little calculated to put the facts of the case in the clear light of day. He must now be allowed to develop without interruption the substantial part of his thesis as to the temporary nature of St. Peter's primacy; any comments will therefore be thrown into footnotes.

The promise [he says] must therefore, as I understand it, describe some *historical manifestatio*n which sprang from St. Peter himself, "not from a confession or a faith or a constancy such as thine, but from *thy* confession, *thy* faith, *thy* constancy." As a matter of exegesis, it seems to be more strictly explained *not* of Peter himself; for then we should expect *ἐπὶ σου* rather than *ἐπὶ ταύτη τῇ πέτρᾳ*; but on this constancy, this firmness of thine, to which thy name bears witness, and which has just evinced itself in thy confession."†

from the version used. For there can be little doubt that the person who originally prepared that version fully understood the real drift of the passage. A mere polemical haste to rush at a conclusion can hardly have been so happy in omission, version, and insertion at haphazard.

* "Clem. Rom." ii. 484.

† If this be the meaning of our Lord's words should we not with equal reason expect in the first half of the text: "I say unto thee that this constancy, this firmness of thine is a rock?" And as a matter of mere exegesis, seeing that our Lord's words were "Thou art rock (Cepha), and upon this rock (Cepha)," their application to Peter himself is surely more literal and natural than to the remote and unexpressed idea "this firmness of thine," &c.

Though it denotes a certain primacy given to St. Peter, yet the promise is the same in kind—so far Origen is right—as pertains to all the faithful disciples, more especially to all the apostles.* It is said of Peter here; but it might be said, and is said elsewhere, of the other apostles. They too are the *θεμέλιοι* (Ephes. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14); they too have the power of the keys (John xx. 22 seq.).†

But still it is a primacy, a pre-eminence. . . . In what does this primacy consist? Obviously Peter cannot be the rock, in any sense which trenches on the prerogative of Christ himself. His primacy cannot be the primacy of *absolute sovereignty*; it must be the primacy of *historical inauguration*.‡ When we turn to the Apostolic records we find that this work of initiation is assigned to him in a remarkable way in each successive stage in the progress of the Church. The same faith, the same courage, which prompted the confession and called forth the promise of Christ, follows him all along, leading him to new ventures of faith.

But lest we should misinterpret the position thus assigned to him and attribute to it a continuity and permanence which does not belong to it, he vanishes suddenly out of sight; another more striking personality assumes the chief place, and achieves conquests which he could not have achieved; his name is hardly ever mentioned. He has fulfilled his special mission, and his primacy is at an end.§

The exercise of the primacy is followed out step by step through the first twelve chapters of the Acts. “Peter asserts his primacy in the foundation of the Christian Church”; “he takes the initiative at all the great crises of its development”; finally,

The great conquest of all still awaited him. The Church must become

* In the passage of Origen referred to, no preference in regard to the promise is given to the Apostles above any other of the faithful.

† *Θεμέλιος*, a foundation stone, is quite a different thing from the rock on which a building, foundations and all, stands. We are not here seeking to fix a particular meaning on the text, but only looking into the validity of what our author brings forward. We must therefore point out that in the divine economy St. Peter may be very well both the rock and a foundation stone. Both expressions are figurative, and there is no antagonism in the two independent figures. Nor is there any need to bring them into literal or so to speak physical harmony; who would find any difficulty in our Lord being at once the Good Shepherd and the Door of the Fold? Figures must be interpreted individually.

As regards “the power of the keys,” this is a technical theological, not a scriptural, term. In Scripture the power of binding and loosing is more than once mentioned as conferred generally; “the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” whatever the figure may signify, are explicitly entrusted to St. Peter alone, in words which are “directed with all the force which repetition can give them to the person addressed”—St. Peter (“Clem. Rom.” ii. 487).

‡ Why “must”? Is there nothing between absolute sovereignty and historical inauguration?

§ “Clem. Rom.” ii. 487.

a world-wide Church. . . . By virtue of his primacy Peter is chosen as the recipient of this revelation of revelations. . . . Cornelius the heathen is baptised; and at one stroke all the privileges of the Christian Church are laid before the whole heathen world.

Thus the Lord's promise is fulfilled: the primacy is completed; the foundations are laid on the rock, whether of Peter's confession or of Peter's courage or of Peter's steadfastness. From this time forward the work passes into other hands. The wise master-builder piles up the later storeys of the edifice, for which his manifold gifts and opportunities had fitted him—his Hebraic elementary training, his Greek academic culture, his Roman political privileges. Paul completes what Peter had begun. The silence of the later apostolic history is not less significant than the eloquence of the earlier as to the meaning of Peter's primacy. In the first part he is everything; in the subsequent record he is nowhere at all.* He is only once again mentioned in the Acts (xv. 7), and even here he does not bear the chief part. Where the Church at large, as an expansive missionary Church, is concerned, Paul, not Peter, is the prominent personage; where the Church of Jerusalem appears as the visible centre of unity, James, not Peter, is the chief agent (Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18; Gal. ii. 9, 12). Peter retains the first place, as missionary evangelist to the Hebrew Christians, but nothing more. Moreover, when St. Paul appears on the scene, he is careful to declare emphatically his independence and equality with the other apostles. "I reckon," he says, in one place, "that I fall short in no whit of the very chiefest apostles" (2 Cor. xi. 5); then again while devoting two whole chapters to recording the achievements of his apostleship, he repeats almost the same words, "I am become a fool; ye have compelled me; for I fall short in no whit of the very chiefest apostles, even though I am nothing" (2 Cor. xii. 11). Accordingly he claims all the privileges of an apostle (1 Cor. ix. 5).†

* The idea that primacy and activity, official position and personal influence are correlative—that the primate must bear the chief part and be the most prominent personage and the chief agent—lies at the basis of much of Bishop Lightfoot's argumentation. The proposition needs only to be stated in its native crudeness to make it clear that it is a confusion of thought.

† "The very chiefest Apostles" is the translation of the Authorised Version for *οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι*; but the margin of the Revised Version gives "those pre-eminent Apostles," and Liddell and Scott say "those who are ever so undeniably apostles," or, in the latest edition, "those who are beyond all doubt apostles." And to any one who will read 2 Cor. x, xi, xii, either of Liddell and Scott's versions will appear the appropriate one. Some teachers were undermining St. Paul's authority with the Corinthians, saying he was only a second-rate apostle, or even not a true apostle. Against these disparagers of his mission St. Paul asserts the fulness of his apostolic powers and his equality therein with the foremost members of the Apostolic College.

As regards "independence," there is nothing about it.

The other text referred to (1 Cor. ix. 5) is (to use the Revised Version): "Have we no right to eat and to drink? Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?"

What bearing can all, or any, of the foregoing have on St. Peter's primacy?

Moreover especially, he asserts his absolute equality with Peter (Gal. ii. 7 *seq.*);* and he gives practical proof of his independence by openly rebuking Peter, when Peter's timidity endangered the freedom and universality of the Church. If there was any primacy at this time, it was the primacy not of Peter, but of Paul.†

The first impression made upon our minds by the foregoing extract is that the arguments advanced in it are one and all quite familiar to us: they have been in common use for the past three centuries. Whence we gather that Bishop Lightfoot had really nothing to add to the case his predecessors had made out.‡ This is beyond doubt a fact of no small importance. But, on second thoughts, we realise that these arguments are here made to do a different duty from that assigned them in their traditional use among Protestant controversialists. These latter denied that the Petrine texts had conferred any primacy on St. Peter, and in these circumstances the argument of equality drawn from the passages in St. Paul's Epistles may have had some weight. But unbelieving critics in Germany—men with no higher interests at stake than those of pure scholarship and accurate exegesis—have forced scholars of Bishop Lightfoot's quality off the old Protestant ground. Now, therefore, that it is recognised our Lord did give St. Peter

* Let St. Paul speak for himself:—"They who were of repute [evidently James, Cephas and John] imparted nothing to me: but contrariwise, when they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with the gospel of the circumcision (for he that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles); and when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, they who are reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision" (Gal. ii. 6-9).

† "Clem. Rom.," ii. 489, 490. The allusion in the closing lines of the text is of course to the celebrated occasion at Antioch, when St. Paul resisted St. Peter "to the face because he stood condemned" (Gal. ii. 11), and rebuked him for "dissimulation" and not "walking uprightly." In his edition of the Galatians, Bishop Lightfoot thus paraphrases St. Paul's words: "At Antioch I was more than an equal. I openly rebuked the leading Apostle of the circumcision." When an inferior remonstrates with or openly rebukes a superior, does he thereby become more than an equal, does he even assert equality? When a subject has rebuked a king, or a bishop has rebuked a pope, have they really changed places and relations?

‡ An unguarded expression in "Clem. Rom.," i. p. 96, might easily be understood as meaning that an argument for the equality of the two Apostles is furnished by St. Clement, who "co-ordinates the authority of St. Peter and St. Paul as leaders of the Church"; but a reference to the preceding page and to page 9 of the same volume, shows that this is urged only against the extreme tenets of the Ebionites of the second century and the Tübingen school of our own.

a primacy, these same arguments are put in in evidence of the temporary character of that primacy. There has been a complete shifting of the ground, whereby what used to be arguments have become at most mere objections, and in their new function they are shorn of whatever force or plausibility they may formerly have had.

Reviewing as a whole the argument whereby Bishop Lightfoot seeks to neutralise the recognition of the primacy given by our Lord to St. Peter, we find it to fall under three heads.

Firstly, an attempt to weaken the force of the Petrine texts. After proving that by the words of Holy Writ it appears that our Lord really did confer upon St. Peter a primacy, a pre-eminence, among the Apostles, he goes on to argue, by the help of Origen, that, after all, what was given to St. Peter was nothing more than what was given to the other Apostles. How far Origen has availed in this cause we have seen.

Secondly, the silence about St. Peter in the second half of the Acts, which indicates that the primacy was only temporary.

Thirdly, a number of expressions and incidents in the Epistles of St. Paul, showing that the primacy had, as a matter of fact, ceased. This branch of the argument has been sufficiently dealt with in the foregoing footnotes and in what has been said just above.

The first and third members being removed, it is found that the backbone of the argument lies in the second—viz., the silence of the second half of the Acts. Here is an argument from silence, of a truth. And great indeed must be the power of that silence if it is to effect the purpose here assigned to it. For it has to limit and negative one of the most striking pronouncements that ever fell from our Lord's lips. The argument from silence, more than any other, requires to be handled with care and applied with caution. In other cases of silence Bishop Lightfoot is fully alive to the danger of assuming that the "silence means exactly what we wish it to mean." Indeed, "the argument from silence has been so often abused, that one is almost afraid to employ it at all." Yet throughout this dissertation on St. Peter "the argument from silence is courageously and extensively applied." Nay, Bishop Lightfoot is as "eloquent on the silence of" St. Luke as is the author of *Supernatural Religion* on the silence of Eusebius. Yet, as in

the case of Eusebius, so in St. Luke's, surely "the first care of the critic should be to inquire with what aims and under what limitations he executed this portion of his work."* Any such inquiry would carry us far beyond our limits; nor is there any need for it, as more than one reason, natural or providential, at once suggests itself for the story of the Acts leaving Peter and following Paul; thus, after all, the particular argument which is to effect so much is at best but an interpretative inference, and by no means a necessary one.

But let us for a moment leave the region of formal discussion of points of exegesis and criticism and logic, and see how the matter looks when viewed from a higher level.

Bishop Lightfoot practically regards the silence of the second half of the Acts as nothing less than a providential dispensation "lest we should misinterpret" our Lord's words and attribute to what they conferred upon St. Peter "a continuity and permanence which does not belong to it."† Now it is an historical fact, as all must acknowledge, that these words have more profoundly than any others in the Gospel story affected the Church as the organised Kingdom of Christ. Not merely then must one who thinks as Bishop Lightfoot, consider that they have been misinterpreted, but furthermore that by them the Church has in all ages been enthralled. Bishop Lightfoot was a believer, and those who believe that Jesus Christ is God cannot forget that all He said was said with full meaning and foreknowledge. He must have known full well that these words of His would prove a fruitful source of error to His Church, a snare to innumerable souls. And the only warning He has to give, the only remedy He has to apply is—the silence of the second half of the Acts!

Here there is a parting of the ways. To many, among whom must be Bishop Lightfoot himself, the history of the Church is from the beginning a story of grave and ever accelerated declension; it is, as in the case of Stephen and Cyprian, the wrong ever overcoming the right, and more than anything else in virtue of a false interpretation of these words of our Saviour. How dreary, how lifeless, how enigmatic a study must such Church history be.

* "Essays on Supernatural Religion," 33, 84.

† "Clem. Rom.," ii. 487.

To us, on the other hand, the story of God's Church is full indeed of contradiction, for she has to face the world, and full of failing, for she is made up of sons of Adam; but fuller still by far of joy and peace in believing that it is the manifestation, slow and patient, but ever unfolding, of God's providential government of His faithful people. And these words of our blessed Lord, spoken to the poor Fisherman, are as that grain of mustard seed, which, indeed, is less than all seeds, but which once sown has ever been growing up and putting out great branches, till in due time it became a tree, so that the nations of the earth have come and lodged under the shadow thereof.

St. Peter's primacy has detained us long, but the discussion, though worn almost threadbare, has not lost its import. It is, too, an instructive study to see this really good and able man struggling thus to free himself from the toils of the great Petrine texts.

Bishop Lightfoot's reading of the historical facts arising out of St. Peter's connection with the Roman Church will be considered in a second article. E. CUTHBERT BUTLER, O.S.B.

POSTSCRIPT.—The foregoing article was already in type when the recently published "Primitive Saints and the See of Rome," by the Rev. W. F. Puller, came to my hands. The author, so far as the ground covered by the present article is concerned, has little to add to Bishop Lightfoot's presentment of the case. In regard to the history of the Roman See in primitive times, *i.e.*, in the first two and a-half centuries, he is evidently unacquainted with the progress and results, and apparently even the nature, of recent investigations, and stands in these matters very much on the footing of the old-fashioned controversial books now out of date. Thus the *Conrenire* of St. Irenaeus is still for him "to resort" (*cf. e.g.*, Harnack, "Dogmengeschichte," i. 406); the "*potentior principalitas*" applies to the city, not the Church (*cf.* Lightfoot, "Ign. and Polyc.", ii. 191). Mr. Puller (App. Note B) discusses at length passages from St. Cyprian, which, he contends, have been "twisted" by Ultramontane writers from their true sense. From the same passages Harnack concludes that without doubt St. Cyprian in his controversy with St. Stephen put himself into contradiction with his previously expressed views on the position of the Roman See in regard to the Church. Is Harnack, too, among the Ultramontanes?

So far as concerns its bearings on the highly interesting and important question of the origins and progress of the pre-eminence of the Roman Church and See, Mr. Puller's book cannot be regarded in any other light than as a contribution to current and ordinary controversy, which will have, sooner or later, to be modified as the results of the labours of dispassionate historical critics become more common property than is at present the case in this country.

ART. II.—THE HON. CHARLES LANGDALE.

“A Discourse preached in the Chapel of Houghton, at the Funeral of the Hon. Charles Langdale, S.J., December 9th, 1868, by Father Gallwey, S.J.”

II.

AT the time Mr. Langdale retired from Parliament, a large family was growing up and surrounding his table. By his two marriages he had had fifteen children, some of whom died in infancy. This will be the proper place to write a few words about him as the father of a family. As he devoted so large a portion of his life to providing a good education for Catholic children, it is interesting to know how he brought up his own. He does not seem to have preferred a home education even for his daughters. His sons were either at Stonyhurst or at Ushaw, and the greater part of the education of his daughters was at different convents. He attended the baptism of all his children, and as soon as the priest had concluded the ceremony, he used to kneel at one of the benches of the chapel, and, the baby being laid in his arms, he remained some minutes praying most fervently, offering up the child to God.

I remember well [says Miss Langdale], as all his children must do, going, as soon as drest in the morning, to say my morning prayers to him in his dressing-room, where we always found him on his kuees, praying. And I also well remember, on my seventh birthday, being sent for to his library, where he most impressively explained the obligation of renewing my baptismal vows, and then made me do so, which he did to all his children at the same age. We must all remember so regularly going to him in his library every Sunday morning, for half an hour, before our dinner-time, to say our catechism, and be questioned and instructed in it by him. One of our greatest pleasures as children, when we came into dessert, was to hear papa tell us stories out of the Old Testament. I know that it was a system with papa to watch the first little symptoms of obstinacy or self-will in each child, and to make a point of gaining the victory, and making them submit to what he had told them to do, though even a mere trifle. This he did by calm perseverance, trying kindness and caressing first; and then, when finding the child would not yield, he patiently waited, not letting them stir till he had conquered their little fit of obstinacy. I have known him do this to

a child who was only just beginning to speak, and wait hours, and even sacrifice things apparently of consequence ; but he used to say that he considered it most important to gain this first victory, as they seldom or ever afterwarde attempted to disobey. He was far, however, from wishing to see his children without spirit. On the contrary, he always disliked and tried to overcome anything like cowardice, or want of becoming ardour and energy, in a character ; and it was evident how he enjoyed the innocent mischief, and sometimes daring acts of courage, of his sons or other young boys.

It is a pleasure to add that the love and care bestowed by Mr. Langdale in the education of his family were appreciated and largely shared by the excellent ladies who were the mothers of his children. Charles Langdale's care and attention were not confined to his own family. He used to visit the sick and suffering in his neighbourhood, and give them all the comfort and assistance he could. This practice of his was so well appreciated that, as his daughter Mary says, when a tenant farmer of his had the misfortune to shoot his arm, and the doctor decided that the limb must be amputated, his first wish was that her father should be present at the operation, and accordingly sent to beg him to come to him, which her father did, and remained with the man during the whole time. Miss Langdale adds : " It was evident how much his nature shrank from it ; still he never for a moment demurred about complying with the poor sufferer's request." He gave away a great deal of money to the poor, and this was his habit, as well as that of visiting the poor, long before he joined the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. " He never let a beggar ask an alms without giving him something. In one case, where he was during a course of years a very considerable benefactor, but quite unknown to the recipients, one of his children strongly advised him to let the objects of his charity know who their friend was, in order that he might have the benefit of their prayers ; but he would not, saying : ' Almighty God knows it all, and you don't suppose that He will let me lose anything because I choose to keep it secret.' " Reverence seems to have had a large share in the character and disposition of Charles Langdale. " It was sufficient to inspire any one with devotion," says his daughter, " to see his look of reverence when entering a church. He seemed prostrated, as has been remarked to me, with respect."

It is time now to speak of the Catholic Institute, which did some good work in its day, of which Mr. Langdale was chairman of the General Committee, which owed its usefulness mainly to him, and out of which he, with the consent of the bishops, formed the Educational Committee, the immediate predecessor of the Poor School Committee. The Institute had its origin in the Catholic Tract Society, which was commenced through the persevering exertions of William Eusebius Andrews, "to whose exertions," says Father Herbert Lucas, "as a publisher of cheap Catholic literature, our priests and people owed so much in the earlier decades of this century."*

The Catholic Tract Society was established in the year 1834. Andrews had made several attempts to set it on foot, but without success. He at last succeeded, and the Society was formed at a public meeting held on the 28th of September in the above-mentioned year, at the Wheat Sheaf Tavern, in Rathbone Place, Oxford Street. The chairman of the meeting was a well-known Irish barrister, Daniel Ffrench, commonly called Counsellor Ffrench.† The object of the Society was, as expressed in the first resolution, to circulate "cheap controversial essays on the disputed points of doctrine, to promote the light of truth, and dispel the darkness of error." The distribution of tracts was immediately begun, and some very useful ones were published. Three years afterwards the Tract Society was saved from collapse by the infusion of new life. This was effected by enlarging its scope. In addition to the distribution of tracts, the object of the new organisation was, in general terms, to watch over and protect the interests of the Catholics of Great Britain, with special reference to those unable to help themselves—such as soldiers, sailors, men, women and children in workhouses and hospitals; and also to the assistance, as far as possible, of what were then called poor-schools. This new association was formed in the year 1838, and was called the Catholic Institute. It was patronised by all the

* See three articles on the Catholic Institute in the *Month* for June, July, and August, 1884, to which I am much indebted in writing this article, especially for the account of the correspondence between Mr. Langdale and the Government in 1846-47.

† Ffrench, with many eccentricities, was an accomplished scholar. One of the Protestant Bishops, accusing the Catholics of ignorance, Ffrench wrote him a long answer in Greek.

Vicars-Apostolic, by the majority of the Catholic nobility and gentry, and by large numbers of the Catholic middle class, both English and Irish. It produced branch associations in some of the principal towns in the island. As Mr. Langdale was then in Parliament, and consequently residing for a considerable portion of the year in London, and as he had shown in the House of Commons his extraordinary capabilities as an advocate of the Catholic cause, he was called upon to take the lead in the Institute as Chairman of the General Committee. He consented to act, and from that time began that active co-operation of the Catholic clergy and laity for the redress of grievances which lasted for nearly thirty years. During the whole of that time Charles Langdale was the acknowledged leader of the English Catholic laity. It is impossible in the short space of a review to go through all the work which the Institute did.* For a few years it did solid and lasting good in all the departments of work for which it was founded, and this mainly through the fidelity and energy of Mr. Langdale. The Institute was the first organisation of British Catholics, for what may be called general purposes, since the year 1829. The Catholic Association ceased with the passing of the great Act of Emancipation, and no other society immediately followed it. From what has been said in a former article in this REVIEW,† the reader will not be surprised to hear that it was the custom during the decade, from 1829 to 1839, amongst those who immediately benefited by the Emancipation Act, to discourage anything like agitation for further rights. They felt no wrongs themselves, and they did not appreciate those which did grievous injury to the poorer portion of the community; even many of those who gave their names as members of the Institute thought that a great deal more was made of the injustice done to Catholics than the facts would justify. These gave but a weak support to Mr. Langdale. He knew, and not only knew but reflected on, what was actually taking place. The number of Catholics in public institutions was gradually increasing, and they were left, for all they required as Catholics,

* The Secretary to the Institute was Mr. Smith, formerly a writer in Edinburgh, then a recent convert. He was the father of the late Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh.

† The DUBLIN REVIEW for October 1892, article "Charles Langdale."

entirely at the mercy of Protestant magistrates, governors and committees. Mr. Langdale and those who heartily supported him took up the cause of the persecuted poor, and, undeterred by the apathy of many Catholics, worked hard in every way they could to obtain relief. The great majority of the Catholic nobility and gentry were at that time Whigs. Their fathers became admirers, and, as far as they could in those days, supporters of Mr. Fox, when he first took up the Catholic cause, and the sons followed in the same line. It was the Whigs, aided by one distinguished Tory, Mr. Canning, who had fought for Catholic Emancipation from the death of Pitt and Fox up to the time when O'Connell brought that new and powerful force into the field which forced the Duke of Wellington to surrender. Many of the Catholic families felt so much gratitude to the Whigs, that it seemed to them there was something ungracious in asking for more. Mr. Langdale, though a strong Whig himself, was determined to ask for everything which would put Catholics on an equality with their Protestant fellow-subjects. In pursuing this course he did not hesitate, as we have seen, to put pressure on the leaders of his own party. He acted up to this principle both in Parliament and in public. Mr. Langdale's action did in practice start a Catholic party. His idea was that all Catholics, no matter what their political opinions might be, should be united when the interests of religion were at stake. He was supported by many with eagerness, and by some with a grumble. Whenever he wanted the names of those who backed him to appear, he had no difficulty in procuring their signatures to a petition or an address, and, if necessary, their presence at a meeting. He could always command enough support to show that the vast majority of English Catholics thought as he did and were represented by him.

The life of the Catholic Institute was not a long one. It was not finally dissolved until the autumn of the year 1847, having lasted nine years. But for several years before that it practically existed only in its educational department. From its commencement in the year 1838 to the end of the year 1842, it worked at first with energy, then with less vigour; and towards the latter date it began to languish. It had done some useful work, chiefly in the publication and distribution of

tracts, and in seconding and supporting Mr. Langdale in his endeavours to obtain justice for the Catholic poor, in the House of Commons. In the years 1839, 1840, 1841, and 1842 temporary enthusiasm was excited by the great orations of O'Connell which he delivered in the summer of those years at the annual meeting of the Institute.

I will here interrupt the history of the Institute to give my impressions of Mr. Langdale at the time of its first formation. It was, I think, in the summer of 1839 that I first became acquainted with Mr. Langdale. It was merely a very formal introduction. It was at a meeting of the General Committee of the Institute, on to which I had been put against what, to use a modern expression, I considered the fitness of things, being then not out of my teens. I remember the occasion very well. Mr. Langdale received me with a certain mixture of dignity and kindness which I afterwards found was habitual with him in his intercourse with strangers. He told me that he was glad to see me on the committee; but nothing else passed between us. He was then in his fifty-second year. He was tall and stood very upright, like a man who had been drilled to throw his shoulders well back. He was not what I should call handsome, but had a very aristocratic countenance. He was altogether a very commanding figure. His face was much wrinkled; his hair was light, rather inclining to red, short and very curly. His serious cast of countenance was only a little short of sternness; but when animated or pleased, there was something very manly and attractive in his look. He was peculiar in his dress. He habitually, except of course in his evening dress, wore what, I suppose, would be called a cut-away coat; but the waist was longer and the skirts broader than was fashionable in that style of dress, and, what was very unusual in a long-waisted coat, every button from the chin to the waist was buttoned. If no other description had been given of him than this custom of buttoning his coat, he might easily have been singled out in an assembly of a thousand gentlemen. I don't remember ever to have seen him in a frock-coat, which was the usual morning dress of the period. At the committee meeting I have mentioned, and on the very few subsequent occasions when I attended the General Committee, it struck me that Mr.

Langdale was himself very heartily in the work of the Institute, but that somehow or other he had not very great confidence in the persevering energies of those about him.*

To resume the history of the Institute : in the year 1843 the interest of English Catholics in the organisation was dying out. O'Connell was too much engaged in his famous "Monster Meetings" in Ireland to attend even at Westminster, and therefore was unable to attempt as usual to rouse us from our apathy. However, the Institute was still alive, and a meeting was held in the Freemasons' Hall. But in the year 1844 there was no meeting. Mr. Langdale must at this time have given up all hope of seeing the Institute supported as an organisation for watching over the rights and interests in general of the Catholics of Great Britain. He no doubt had then resolved that he would no longer waste his energies in trying to blow into a flame what contained hardly a spark to work upon. But he was evidently determined that all his energy (and he had plenty of it) should be given to providing sufficient means of educating those whom he used to call "our little ones." With this object he, with the sanction of the Bishops, obtained at a meeting of the Institute, in the year 1845, a new set of rules empowering an Acting Committee in London to raise funds and do all in their power to promote the great work of the education of the poorer class of Catholics. He was himself chosen to be the chairman of this Committee, and entered upon his duties with all his heart and soul. Mr. Langdale was at this time well and gallantly supported by Frederick Lucas in the *Tablet* newspaper. In consequence of the extension of the work of the Institute to education, additional subscriptions came in ; but they were chiefly from private individuals. The congregational subscriptions were less than ever. An annual general meeting was held in 1846, at which, for the last time, O'Connell spoke. Amongst other things, he recommended the English Catholics, as a means of raising money for the purpose of education, to adopt the plan he had so often found successful in Ireland ; that is, to have in every congregation an organised body of collectors to receive the small contributions of the poor.

* As I was by many years the youngest man on the Committee, my attendances were not very frequent. It was, I think, about two years after my first introduction to Mr. Langdale that I first met him in society.

He thought the English Catholics, if earnest in the work, might raise £50,000 a year. But the Catholics in England heeded not the advice of O'Connell, and little or nothing was done.*

Between the general meeting in the spring of 1846 and the general meeting held on the 11th of April in the year 1847, the subscriptions again produced a very diminished sum; and it was clear that the English Catholics were not going to provide for the education of their children through the Acting Committee of the Catholic Institute. But Mr. Langdale's determination to exert all his power and influence to provide means for the support and multiplication of the poor-schools urged him to commence a correspondence with the Government, which, though not immediately successful, was in reality the first step towards obtaining a great act of justice. The report read at the meeting in 1847 gave an account of a correspondence between Mr. Langdale, Sir Robert Peel, Lord John Russell, and Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth, on the question of the admittance of Catholics to a share in the annual grant for education. But, before putting a summary of this correspondence before the reader, it will be useful to give a short account of the grants of public money for the purpose of education. The following account of the origin and the mode of distributing the grant is given by Mr. McCarthy†:

In 1834 the first grant of public money for the purpose of elementary education was made by Parliament. The sum granted was twenty thousand pounds, and the same grant was made every year until 1839. Then Lord John Russell asked for an increase of ten thousand pounds, and proposed a change in the manner of appropriating the money. Up to that time the grant had been distributed through the National School Society, a body in direct connection with the Church of England, and the British and Foreign School Association, which admitted children of all Christian denominations without imposing on them sectarian teaching. Lord John Russell's proposition to increase the grant was agreed to by the House of Commons, "and an Order in Council transferred its distribution" by the Treasury through the two bodies above mentioned "to a Committee of the Privy Council, composed of the President and not more than five members."

The education grant was subsequently increased, in the year

* In one congregation, that of Poplar in London, enough was done, through the energy of the priest, to show what might have been done in other places.

† "History of our Own Times," vol. i. pp. 184 *et seq.*

1847, to £100,000, and a new system of administering the Government grant, and, indeed, of regulating instruction and everything else in those schools which accepted the grant, was introduced by the Education Committee of the Privy Council. This system was to frame certain minutes to carry out the design of the Council, and to put them on the table of the House of Commons. The minutes were discussed in order, and the grant was made and distributed according to the result of the debate, and with the assent of the House of Lords.

In the year 1846, though the Catholic Institute as an association for the protection of Catholic interests in general was languishing unto death, its utility as an organisation for promoting education was increasing in vigour. The Vicars-Apostolic proposed that, instead of leaving the management of the provision of means for educating the poor in the hands of the Acting Committee of the Catholic Institute, an altogether separate committee should be formed for the above purpose. The new committee was to be called the "Education Committee of the Catholic Institute." The Vicars-Apostolic also proposed that the secretary to the committee should be a priest, with no other duties to hinder his entire dedication to the good work. It was thought that a priest would be more likely than a layman to conduct those communications with the clergy which would necessarily follow on an active prosecution of all that the new scheme would involve. The committee was formed, and a priest was appointed secretary.

The Bishops, in order to aid the committee, established an annual collection for the poor-schools in all the districts. To the intense delight of Mr. Langdale, the above propositions were gladly accepted. Mr. Langdale, indeed, has the merit of originating the idea of forming a separate committee; though, in consequence of his habitual sinking of himself in all good deeds, this was not publicly known. It was, I think, after the first meeting of this committee that, as I was walking away with him down Regent Street, he told me that for years he had been urging the Bishops to establish a special organisation to promote the education of the Catholic poor children. It was not often that Mr. Langdale spoke enthusiastically of work he was himself engaged in, but on this occasion it was impossible not to see that he was enjoying intense satisfaction.

The confidence of the Bishops in Mr. Langdale was so great that they not only made use of his services to raise the pecuniary means of education, and to superintend the distribution of those means, but they entrusted him with the management of everything connected with the education of the poor which the chairman of a committee could exercise, and which did not come, as so many questions in this matter do come, within the exclusive jurisdiction of the clergy.

Immediately on the establishment of the Education Committee, Mr. Langdale turned his attention to the right of Catholics to receive a share in the Government grant. He commenced a correspondence with the Prime Minister, who was then Sir Robert Peel, asking for an interview. Sir Robert was then beset by his enemies, who were determined if possible to ruin him for having dared to trench upon their landed interests while he was bestowing upon the English people the greatest boon they had received during the century, the boon of cheap bread. Mr. Langdale received for reply that Sir Robert's time was so completely occupied that he was obliged to decline an interview for a few days. The interview never came off; for about a week after the letter was written, Sir Robert was beaten in the House of Commons by a junction of the Protectionists with the Whigs and Radicals, and he accordingly resigned. Peel was succeeded by Lord John Russell as Premier, with whom Mr. Langdale opened communications. He was referred to the Committee of Council on Education, Lord Lansdowne being the President of the Council. Mr. Langdale then requested an interview with Lord Lansdowne, but all that he obtained in answer was that the Catholic claims to a share of the education fund should be maturely considered. This was in August 1846. Mr. Langdale waited for five months, and then again applied to Lord Lansdowne in January 1847. In answer to this application, Mr. Langdale received a letter from Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth, a gentleman who had taken a good deal of interest in educational matters, whose name was for some years connected with the Committee of Council on Education, and who had lately been appointed secretary to that body. In this letter Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth said he was directed by Lord Lansdowne to say that he would "bring under the consideration of the Committee of Council on

Education any application accompanied with all requisite particulars which may be made for assistance towards the erection of a Roman Catholic as well as of any other school." The letter added, "that their Lordships would thus be enabled, upon a careful examination of the constitution of the school, to determine whether, under their present minutes, they can grant such assistance." Exactly a week after the receipt of this letter, Mr. Langdale made an application for aid to Catholic schools at Blackburn. In the course of a fortnight Mr. Langdale received an answer in which Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth said "his Lordship" (that is, Lord Lansdowne) "wishes to be informed whether the proposed schools are to be exclusively Catholic; and if not, what arrangement, if any, it is proposed to make with a view to the exemption of Protestant children who may attend the schools from the religious instruction to be given there."

It now became publicly known that the Government was favourable to the project of including Catholic schools in the grant for education. The grant was to be increased this year to £100,000. The Wesleyan-Methodists took the alarm, and a deputation from them, headed by Sir Culling Eardley Smith, went to Lord John Russell to complain and to protest against Catholics sharing with the Church of England and themselves the education grant. Lord John, in his turn, became alarmed, and was afraid that he might lose the Nonconformist votes. He therefore bethought him that it would be a highly proper thing, very acceptable to the religious mind of the English, and calculated to appease the Wesleyan-Methodists, if he were to continue to insist upon the condition that the Authorised Version of the Scriptures should be read in any school to be assisted. The Catholics would have no right to complain, as they were living in a country where a translation of the Bible had been settled by Royal authority. Accordingly, on the 19th of April 1847, Lord John announced in the House of Commons, that as Parliamentary grants according to the minutes of 1839 were to be confined to those schools in which the Scriptures—that is, in the Authorised Version—were read, he did not see any occasion to raise a question on the subject then, and did not think it desirable to spend any part of the £100,000 upon the support of Roman Catholic schools. This announcement was

felt as a severe blow by Catholics, and by no one more so than Mr. Langdale. Astonishment and indignation prevailed amongst them. But some consolation soon followed. Sir William Molesworth gave notice of a motion to the following effect: that no application of public money by the Committee of Council for Education would be acceptable to the House, under minutes which excluded the Roman Catholics from a share in the grant. In support of this motion Mr. Langdale used all his influence with the Whig and Radical members, and with his friend Sir James Graham, who was a Peelite, to induce them to vote with Sir William. The clerical secretary of the Institute was sent to Lancashire to collect evidence of the number of Catholic children for whom there was no room in the schools, and of other matters the knowledge of which would be useful in the coming debate.* The same collection of evidence was made amongst the London congregations. As the day for the discussion of Sir William Molesworth's motion approached, it became well known that he would have a large following. Lord John Russell had to make up his mind whether with the Whigs who would stand by him and the Ministry, aided by those Tories who as a matter of course would vote against the Catholics, he could venture to withstand Sir William and come off with a substantial majority. Lord John Russell was a bold man, but he decided on this occasion that discretion was the better part of valour. When the day came for the discussion of Sir William's motion and the Baronet had made his speech, Lord John proposed a compromise. If the House would consent to pass the minutes as they stood for this year, he would engage that they should be so altered as to admit the Catholics to a share in the grant for the next and following years. On this announcement Sir William withdrew his motion.† This was the first victory won by the Catholics in the matter of Government assistance to their schools. Lord Beaumont also alluded to the subject in the House of Lords, and remarked that "it required some ingenuity to place

* Amongst other items, the secretary brought back to London the intelligence that there were ten thousand Catholic children in Manchester who were not receiving any education.

† Since the above was in print, I have been reminded that Sir William divided the House upon his motion, and carried it by a large majority.

upon the minute of December 1839 the construction implied—namely, that no version but the Authorised Version was to be used in the schools."

On the 21st of April in this year 1847, just two days after Lord John Russell's announcement that Catholics were not to be included in the educational grant, the last annual meeting of the Catholic Institute was held. Several of the Vicars-Apostolic attended the meeting, and spoke out boldly. "We have been deceived," said Bishop Briggs, "by her Majesty's present Ministers." Bishop Sharples said: "I am astonished at the treatment which the Bishops have received at the hands of Ministers; but," he added, "I am astonished still more at the apathy evinced by the Catholic body." Bishop Brown said that the Government had refused our claims "upon no other than a principle of cowardice." Bishops Wiseman and Ullathorne also spoke strongly, the former especially in showing the duplicity of several members of the Cabinet. Bishop Griffiths had already applied to Lord John Russell to receive a deputation from the Bishops on the subject of the conditions upon which Catholic schools should be assisted; but this was rendered useless for the time being by the conduct of the noble lord as already related. In anticipation of the minutes being so framed as to include Catholics, Bishop Walsh, the senior Vicar-Apostolic, had written to Mr. Langdale in the name of all the Bishops giving him information and instructions to be used in any communications he might have with the Government, as chairman of the Educational Committee of the Catholic Institute. A question also arose in the Educational Committee as to calling a public meeting of Catholics to protest against the treatment to which we had been subjected, and to make a distinct claim to our right to receive a share in the Government grant. Mr. Langdale on this occasion made a distinction between a public meeting of the Institute and a public meeting of the English Catholics; and maintained that the Institute had no power to call a meeting of the latter description. A meeting of the Catholic Institute was practically a meeting of the Catholics of England. Not many Catholics from the country would have come to either, and those who would have come up to a general meeting of Catholics would have been almost all, perhaps all of them, members

of the Institute. Mr. Langdale was, however, determined to stand by the theoretical distinction. He would not call a public meeting of English Catholics. There was a decided objection to the calling of a general meeting of the Institute. The annual meeting had just been held, and it had been held two days after the declaration of Lord John Russell that Catholics were not to share in the grant. At that meeting the speakers, including, as the reader has seen, several Vicars-Apostolic, had animadverted in strong language upon the conduct of the Ministry, and as strongly as it would have been necessary to speak at a public meeting of English Catholics. If an extra general meeting of the Institute had been called so soon after the annual meeting, it would have been superfluous; and as some of the speakers would have been, no doubt, exceedingly eloquent in their denunciations of the Ministry, we should have laid ourselves open to the observation which the *Times* made upon us in 1850, when we congratulated Cardinal Wiseman on his arrival in England, two months after date, namely, that we were "lagging enthusiasts." But these objections would not have applied to a public meeting of British Catholics, or at any rate not with the same force as they did to a meeting of the members of the Institute. For although the attendance at the one would have been much the same as the attendance at the other, a meeting of British Catholics would have been theoretically a different meeting; it would have attracted more public notice than a meeting of the Institute; it would have been reported at length in the morning papers, whereas a meeting of the Institute would have had only a short notice, or perhaps no notice at all; and, moreover, it would have been put before the public as a fitting result of the meeting of the Institute which had just been held.

Though Mr. Langdale had irrevocably made up his own mind on the question of a public meeting of Catholics, yet as he never was, and never wished to be, a dictator, several members of the committee who differed in this matter with the chairman were determined to fight the question out. As this squabble in the committee and its results formed a very important turning-point in the life of Charles Langdale, it is necessary to give as short an account as possible of how it proceeded, and how it ended. The reader must not suppose

that Mr. Langdale was opposed to the holding of a public meeting, though he perhaps had not much faith in the good it would effect. His position was that the Catholic Institute had no authority to call the meeting. A formal resolution was made in the committee by Frederick Lucas, that the chairman should call a public meeting of Catholics, and a day was appointed for the discussion of the question. In the meantime both parties prepared for the fight, and a strong "whip" was made on both sides. A good many members who had not often shown themselves on the committee attended on this occasion. I think every one of this class of men voted with Mr. Langdale. However that was, Mr. Langdale defeated Mr. Lucas's motion that a meeting should be called by a large majority. This vote did, in fact, give the *coup de grace* to the existence of the Institute. The reader has seen that, except on the Educational Committee, little or nothing had been done of late years. Now that the committee, the only organisation in the Institute which had any vitality, had refused to act outside its own doors, but in a matter connected with its own usefulness, it appeared that the Institute had abdicated its office of protector of the interests of the Catholics of Great Britain. I do not think the Institute transacted any more general business up to the time of its dissolution, towards the end of the year 1847. That it would do nothing more was well known to both Mr. Langdale and to those who were opposed to him on the question of a general public meeting. It became therefore necessary for the party of action, if I may so call it, to consider what under the circumstances could be done. Mr. Langdale, during one of the committee meetings at which the holding of a meeting was being discussed, in answer to some observation, turned to Mr. Lucas and those who were acting with him, and said, "Call a meeting yourselves, and," he added, "I will attend it." No doubt Mr. Langdale meant what he said, and would have attended a meeting called by some one else. But, "call a general meeting of the Catholics of Great Britain" is a thing more easily said than done, if "done" is to include the assembling as well as the calling of the meeting. There was only one man in England then who could do it; and that man was Mr. Langdale himself. If those whom he told to call a

meeting themselves had done so, if the meeting had been held in the morning the small room at the Freemasons' Tavern would have been about half full ; if it had been held in the evening the large hall would have been crammed to the door ; but the meeting would have represented the British Catholics only a little more than if it had been held in Tipperary. Mr. Langdale might have been there, as he said he would be ; but he would not have been expected to issue circulars and use his influence to induce the Catholic nobility and gentry to follow him. In order to protect Catholic interests in general, it became necessary to form a new association. The result of deliberations in this matter was the establishment of the Association of St. Thomas of Canterbury, of which, as we shall see later, Mr. Langdale became a member. As it became certain that the Catholic Institute would soon be formally dissolved, the question arose, what was to become of the Educational Committee. Some change in its *status* would have to be made. The Institute dying, its committees would die with it. The Educational Committee had shown that it could be of great use both in assisting schools and in corresponding with the Government. The Vicars-Apostolic had sufficiently made known the interest they took in the work of the Committee. Their Lordships settled the question, which was really one of great importance. An experience of forty-six years has proved the wisdom of their action. They established the "Poor-school Committee."

Before concluding this article, it will be proper to consider Mr. Langdale's state of mind in the summer of 1847, with regard to active work, within a layman's sphere, in general matters affecting the interests of British Catholics. He had no doubt come to the conclusion that no association to watch over Catholic interests in general, what we should call in these days a General Purposes Committee, would stand any chance of a permanent existence. When the Association of St. Thomas of Canterbury was occasionally mentioned to him, there was a significant smile upon his face, indicating a suspicion of failure. As before mentioned, he no doubt long ago resolved not to waste time and energy on what he was convinced would not last. But he was determined more than ever to throw all his strength into any specific work which the

Bishops should intrust to him for the good of the Catholic children of Great Britain. At the same time, knowing, as he must have done, his influence with English Catholics, he had no intention of not giving his help, indeed of not leading us, in any temporary emergency. This he proved three years later at the time of the establishment of the Hierarchy. There can, I think, be no doubt that it was this state of mind with regard to his future action in Catholic affairs which made him say, and perhaps it was what he really meant to express, when he said the words mentioned above, "Call a meeting yourselves, and I will attend it." He may also have thought that it was time for men younger than himself to begin to take a more active and leading part in those matters of general interest for which the Catholic Institute had been established. But whatever may have been his definite intention, Mr. Langdale was reserved in the good providence of God to do a great work, and that he gave his whole time and attention to it, except in the few cases when his services were required in some temporary crisis, no British Catholic can ever regret.

W. J. AMHERST, S.J.

ART. III.—SOME RECENT VIEWS ON INSPIRATION.

“ **I**T is the problem of historical criticism,” writes Strauss in the “ New Life of Jesus,”* “ not merely to discover what has really taken place, but also the mode by which one thing has been caused by another. But history must renounce the latter most honourable part of her problem, the moment she is ready to admit the existence of miracle, interrupting, as it does, the causation of one thing by another.” The late M. Renan is plainer still upon the same point †: “ Until a new order of things prevails, we shall maintain then this principle of historical criticism—that a supernatural account cannot be admitted as such, that it always implies credulity or imposture, that the duty of the historian is to explain it, and seek to ascertain what share of truth or error it may conceal.”

The inspiration of sacred Scripture is clearly something supernatural and miraculous. Moreover, the inspired volume abounds with records of the miraculous; its very *raison d'être* is the supernatural, and it is taken up largely with mysteries, transcending the understanding of man. It is not surprising, therefore, that the admirers of such men as Strauss and Renan look upon the sacred Scriptures as being composed, to a great extent, of myth and fable. Starting from such principles as those quoted above, they are bound to regard the Bible merely as the work of man, containing a legendary history of the early days of humanity and the Israelites, which is on a par with the fabulous histories of China, Egypt, and Rome.

Martin Luther attributed to sacred Scripture the fullest possible inspiration extending to every word. What a change has, in late years, come over the successors of the early reformers, when we find an English churchman of eminence laying down, in a sermon preached at St. Mary's, Oxford, that, “ applied to the Bible, as a whole, the expression, ‘ Word of God,’ seems to savour of the old theory of inspiration, which

* Vol. i. p. 197.

† “ Life of Jesus,” p. 30.

no one now cares to maintain."* The new exegesis has evidently modified the views of non-Catholics in reference to the Bible. What then is the present position of the Anglican Church on the subject of Inspiration? In Whitsun week, 1891, Mr. Kirkpatrick, regius professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, at the invitation of the dean and chapter, delivered a course of lectures in the Cathedral of St. Asaph's to a gathering of clergy and laity from different parts of the diocese.† The subject was the Old Testament, and the learned lecturer defended before his audience the most recent views of Biblical critics; and also laid down that inspiration does not guarantee immunity from error in matters of fact, science, or history.

Dr. Driver, canon of Christchurch, Oxford, in his work on the "Literature of the Old Testament," quotes with approval the following words of Professor Sanday, in regard to inspiration:

In all that relates to the revelation of God and of His Will, the writers of the Bible assert for themselves a definite inspiration; they claim to speak with an authority higher than their own. But with regard to the narration of events, and to processes of literary composition, there is nothing so exceptional about them as to exempt them from the conditions to which other works would be exposed at the same time and place.‡

Nor are these views confined to any particular section of the Anglican Church. They find expression at the very headquarters of the High Church party. Dr. Gore, principal of the Pusey House, Oxford, has practically gone over to the teaching of the more recent Biblical critics, as is clear from his paper on Inspiration in the pages of "Lux Mundi" (pp. 337-362). It is true his opinions are enveloped in a cloud of mystic language, regarding the connection between the Holy Spirit and sacred Scripture, but, for all that, the substantial identity of his views with those of Farrar, Driver, and others of the same school, cannot be mistaken. The whole paper is an apology for modern Biblical criticism, and rejects the idea of the protection of sacred Scripture from error in matters of history, science, and the like.

* Driver's "Sermons on the Old Testament," p. 158.

† Divine Library of the Old Testament.

‡ P. xvi.

But it may be said: "These are the opinions of individual Anglicans; men of influence and learning no doubt, but still only individuals; they do not necessarily represent the formal teaching of the Church. What is the attitude of the bishops on this important question? What is the view of the *ecclesia docens* on inspiration?"

One thing may safely be said: a remarkable harmony pervades their lordships' words on the subject. Whether their teaching is likely to throw much light on the matter, we leave our readers to decide from the few specimens we adduce. "We heartily concur with the majority of our opponents," says the Bishop of Gloucester, in "Aids to Faith," p. 404, "in rejecting all theories of inspiration." "Our Church," says Bishop Thirlwall, charge for 1863, "has never attempted to determine the nature of the inspiration of sacred Scriptures." "If you ask me," writes Dr. Cotton, Bishop of Calcutta, "for a precise theory of Inspiration, I confess I can only urge you to repudiate all theories, to apply to theology the maxim which guided Newton in philosophy, *hypotheses non fingo.*" Finally, to take one more instance, the Bishop of Winchester writes: "It seems pretty generally agreed, that definite theories of inspiration are doubtful and dangerous" ("Aids to Faith," p. 303).

So much as to the teaching of the Anglican Church on the question of inspiration. And if it be now asked, has the Catholic Church issued any authoritative definition of inspiration, we have to reply that no direct definition of the term has ever been embodied in a formal utterance of the Church; but decrees have been promulgated by the councils sufficiently explicit in their teaching, for the guidance of Catholics. The decrees of the councils of Florence, Trent, and the Vatican are especially clear and important, and so well known, as to render it unnecessary to reproduce them here in full.

In reality, the Teaching of the Catholic Church upon the subject of inspiration may be summed up in one short sentence, "God is the Author of Sacred Scripture." So taught the fourth council of Carthage in the fourth century, and such is the pith of the Vatican decree of our own day. When, therefore, the Fathers at the Vatican and Trent anathematised any who should refuse to receive the books of the Old and New Testament,

“entire with all their parts,” as *sacred and canonical*, they declared that they did so, because God is the author of these books. Moreover, the council of Florence explains that the inspiration of the sacred books by the Holy Ghost means that they have God as their author, and the Vatican council declares the same thing in still clearer terms. To understand therefore what, according to the teaching of the Catholic Church, inspiration implies, is really to investigate what is entailed in the proposition, “God is the Author of Sacred Scripture.”

The council of Trent pronounces anathema against any who refuse to receive as “sacred and canonical” the books of Scripture entirely *with all their parts*. Before proceeding further, it will be well to determine in what sense the words “with all their parts” were introduced into the decree, and what is the precise meaning of the phrase.

In the original draft of the decree, the concluding words ran as follows* :—“If any one violate these same books and the aforesaid traditions, let him be anathema.” The attention of the Fathers was, however, fixed on certain doubtful fragments of the Gospels, such as the concluding verses of St. Mark (xvi. 9-20), St. Luke’s account of the bloody sweat of our Lord (xii. 43, 44), and the passage of St. John, concerning the woman taken in adultery (viii. 1-11). In the general congregation of March 27, Cardinal Pacheco proposed that these passages should be expressly named in the decree. The commission charged with drawing up the *schema* or draft, however, was opposed to any alteration, and the cardinal’s proposition was rejected. A further question was raised in the congregation of April 1, whether it would not be well, so as to put an end to all doubt, to indicate in the decree, the number of chapters contained in each Gospel. Such an expedient seemed, upon consideration, to be quite useless, as it was pointed out that the inspiration of the doubtful passages might still be called in question. The proposition was accordingly negatived. However, between the congregations of April 1 and 5, the draft of the decree was taken in hand and altered so as to run as follows :—“If any one refuse to receive as sacred

* In this paragraph we follow Theiner’s *Acta authenticæ*.

and canonical these same books, as they are read in the Church, and despise the aforesaid traditions, let him be anathema." This redaction was criticised by the Cardinal of Trent, who said, in substance, that, whereas their object was for the future to put an end to all doubts on the subject of the fragments, which had been under discussion, by this decree they would seem to be receiving only parts of the Gospels, those, namely, which were read in the Church. His contention was approved, and accordingly the words of the draft were again changed, so as to run as they do in the official decree, and the faithful were ordered to receive as sacred and canonical all the books of Scripture *with all their parts*.

From the nature of these preliminary proceedings, it is clear that the words of the Council of Trent, to which we refer, were introduced into the decree, with a view to safeguarding certain disputed passages in the Gospels; still, of course, they cannot be restricted to these passages merely, but refer, as says M. Loisy, to all notable passages of Scripture. "The council certainly understands," he writes,* "by the word 'parts' notable portions of Scripture, such as are the three fragments, which had attracted its attention." Such being the meaning of the words in the decree, how are we to reconcile with it and with the still more explicit teaching of the Vatican council, the following passage from the *Nineteenth Century*? †

Now it is simply unquestionable that, as yet, no decree whatever binds Catholics to regard as inspired anything but such passages as may turn out to have been *scripta propter se*, and it is, of course, conceivable that they may consist only of brief sentences scattered at wide intervals through the sacred books.

If the Council of Trent declares the books and all their parts to be sacred and canonical, and the Vatican council asserts this to be so, because they are inspired by the Holy Ghost, how can it be said that inspiration may conceivably be confined to a few brief sentences throughout the sacred volume?

The Church teaches therefore that the books of sacred Scripture, *with all their parts*, are inspired by the Holy Ghost, or that they have God for their author. What do we mean,

* "Histoire du Canon du Nouveau Testament," p. 262.

† Dr. Mivart's article, July 1887.

when we say that God is the author of sacred Scripture? It is clear that in dealing with the subject, we cannot leave out of sight the fact that there are two agents concerned in the composition of the Bible, the human and the Divine. For, with the exception of the Decalogue, which was engraven on stone by the finger of God, the sacred books were committed to writing by human agents. Consistently with Divine authorship then, what share in the work is to be assigned to man? The Vatican council affords some information on the point which cannot be overlooked. It teaches that it is not enough for inspiration or canonicity, that the books should have been composed by mere human industry and then approved by her authority. Such a decision is only what we should have expected; for, if a book be the composition of man, God cannot be said to be the author, by the later interposition of Church approval. Authorship requires an active part in the composition of the book. Neither is it enough, the council defines, to constitute an inspired book, that it contain revelation without error. Such a book, might no doubt, in a sense, be called Divine, on account of the exalted character of its subject-matter, much in the same way as we speak of the Divine study of theology; but divine in the sense of sacred Scripture it is not. God is not its author, and hence it is not inspired.

On the other hand, it would be unreasonable to suppose that the human agent had no part at all in the composition of the inspired volume. Why should it be said that the words and phraseology were not supplied by him, always supposing him to be so far guided as adequately to express the message which God was conveying to men? Certainly, mere words and forms of expression are not essential to authorship, as is evident from the fact that a man does not cease to be author of a book, translated into a foreign tongue, and that we still believe that we are reading the Word of God, when we read our Bible in Latin or in English. Though it must be borne in mind that there may be, and indeed are, passages in which the very words are supplied by God Himself. Why again, we ask, should we deny a certain freedom to the human agent in the arrangement of his work? Indeed, differences of style and diction, as well as imperfections in order and arrangement, seem to require that

we should make some such concession to the human factor in the composition of sacred Scripture.

Having made this admission, we are in a position to explain difficulties arising out of certain passages that have frequently been brought forward against the inspiration of the Bible. There is, for instance, the well-known passage in Joshua (chap. x.), where it is said that the sun and moon stood still. Bearing in mind what has been said, regarding the share taken by the human agent in the composition of sacred Scripture, we point out, that to him is to be attributed the form of expression employed in this place, by which we are informed, in poetical language, that the daylight was miraculously prolonged. So too, if slight variations occur among the sacred writers in recording the words of our Blessed Lord and others, the fact is easily explained. For we know that it was the substance of the words they were inspired to impart to us ; and that in the choice of language they were left to themselves.* Thus, the four sacred writers who relate the words of our Saviour, in instituting the Blessed Eucharist, give each a slightly different version of them. To take the consecration, under the form of bread, St. Matthew has (xxvi. 26), "Take ye and eat, this is my body;" St. Mark writes (xiv. 12), "Take ye, this is my body;" St. Luke (xxii. 19), "This is my body, which is given for you ;" and St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24), "Take ye and eat, this is my body, which shall be delivered for you." Here we have four distinct versions of our Lord's words, yet all agreeing in substance ; and from the variations that exist in the different texts, some idea may be gained of the latitude conceded to the human agent, consistently with the substantially accurate reproduction of the original words.

Divine authorship, then, does not entail the inspiration of every word in the Bible. How far does it extend ? Are there any passages in the sacred volume which do not come under the sanction of inspiration, and are, what are called, *obiter dicta*? Cardinal Newman certainly argues in favour of such a restriction, in his article on inspiration in the *Nineteenth Century* ;† and in a *postscript* to that article, published the

* "St. Augustine Consens. Evang." ii. 27.

† February 1884.

same year, in pamphlet form, lays down (p. 15), the following, as the advantage of such a concession :

The very comfort of an *obiter dictum* to the Catholic, whether in its relation to infallibility or to inspiration, whether in dogma or in Scripture, is, that it enables him in controversy to pass by a difficulty, which may else be pressed on him, without his having the learning perhaps, or the knowledge, or the talent, to answer it; and it enables him to profess either Yes or No in questions which are beyond him, and on which nothing depends. In difficult questions it leaves the Catholic student at peace.

Whether any advantage is to be derived from the *obiter dictum* in sacred Scripture, would seem to depend on the meaning assigned to that term; and it is not very clear from the Cardinal's words in what sense he employs it. In one sentence he lays down that we are not "to conclude that the record of facts in Scripture does not come under the guarantee of its inspiration" (p. 12), and in the *postscript* he calls attention, with some warmth, to the fact of his having done so. Moreover, towards the end of his article, he quotes the words of Professor Lamy respecting *obiter dicta*, and seems there to be using the term in the same sense as the professor. In that case, *obiter dicta* would consist of such minute matters as, for instance, what is said of the dog of Tobias, St. Paul's cloak, and the salutations at the end of the Epistles.

If such be the meaning of the term, it is clear that when such men as Patrizzi, Lamy, and apparently Ubaldi, do not venture to condemn the interpreter for recognising their presence in sacred Scripture, the authority of the Church cannot be invoked against him. But we may well ask, of what advantage to the student is such a restriction on inspiration? The possibility of the inspiration of such passages will be admitted by all who believe in inspiration at all. That any evidence will be forthcoming to shake the credibility of the facts contained in them, is hardly a practical question. German criticism pries with sufficiently microscopic gaze into the sacred text, but it is, to say the least, unlikely, that any startling discoveries, of such a kind as to disturb the peace of mind of the Catholic student, will be made either regarding the dog of Tobias or the cloak of the Apostle Paul.

If, on the other hand, the words *obiter dicta* have a wider

meaning—as, indeed, in one place at least, the Cardinal seems to imply, where he says (p. 198) that “*by obiter dicta* in Scripture, I also mean such statements as we find in the book of Judith, that Nabuchodonosor was king of Nineve”—then a far wider field is opened up before us, and we are at a loss to know in what sense the Cardinal regards—as he does—the facts of Scripture, as coming under the guarantee of inspiration. From certain words that he uses earlier in the article (p. 189), in which he explains how the facts of Scripture may be said to be inspired, it would almost seem that it is for the Bible history, in its substantial fulness only, that he makes this claim.

Are we therefore to conclude [he writes] that the record of facts in Scripture does not come under the guarantee of its inspiration? We are not so to conclude, and for this plain reason—the sacred narrative, carried on through so many ages, what is it but the very matter and rule of our obedience? What but that narrative itself is the supernatural teaching, in order to which inspiration is given? What is the whole history, traced out in Scripture from Genesis to Esdras, and thence to the end of the Acts of the Apostles, but a manifestation of Divine Providence, on the one hand interpretative, on a large scale and with analogical applications of universal history, and on the other preparatory, typical and predictive, of the Evangelical Dispensation? Its pages breathe of providence and grace, of our Lord, and of His works and teaching, from beginning to end. It views facts in these relations, in which neither ancients, such as the Greek and Latin classical historians, nor moderns, such as Niebuhr, Grote, Ewald or Michelet, can view them. In this point of view it has God for its author, even though the finger of God traced no words but the Decalogue. Such is the claim of the Bible history in its substantial fulness to be accepted *de fide* as true. In this point of view, Scripture is inspired, not only in faith and morals, but in all its parts which bear on faith, including matters of fact.

These words, taken in connection with what the Cardinal further says, that *obiter dicta* include such statements as that Nabuchodonosor was king of Nineve, seem to show that he regards inspiration as covering the Old Testament history in its substantial fulness only, but as not guaranteeing the accuracy of particular statements throughout the history. Dr. Mivart certainly seems to have understood the Cardinal to have written somewhat in this sense, and to have indicated a road along which one less fettered by official position might boldly advance. He does not, indeed, allude to the passage just quoted, but to others pointing in the same direction, and writes

as follows:—"In the matter of Biblical criticism, Cardinal Newman has himself taken a step which, though a very cautious and short one, as befits his responsible position as a prince of the Church, yet seems to indicate a road along which persons less officially fettered may boldly advance." He had said immediately before of the inspired passages of sacred Scripture:—"It is conceivable that they may consist only of brief sentences, scattered at wide intervals through the sacred books."

What, then, is to be said of this view of inspiration? May we concede to the human factor in the composition of the sacred volume, that, whilst the history in its substantial fulness has God for its author, to Him are to be attributed the authorship of particular statements, and that such statements as that Nabuchodonosor was king of Nineve are *obiter dicta*? The formal teaching of the Church is confined to the utterances of the general councils on the subject, and does not seem to go beyond laying down that God is, in a real and true sense, the author of sacred Scripture. But it is certain that the teaching of Catholic theologians is opposed to the view that would admit the possibility of error in the inspired volume, whether in science or in fact; and in this matter they are but following the Fathers of the Church. For they certainly understood by Divine authorship, that God so guided the inspired writers, as to preserve them from error in every subject of which they treated. It may therefore be said to be the general teaching of the theologians on the subject of inspiration, that, whilst not extending to style and phraseology, it safeguards the accuracy of sacred books, *quoad res et sententias*.

Having said so much as to the extent and limits of inspiration, we proceed to discuss briefly three points, which we do not say restrict the area of inspiration, but save us from confounding with it what is not necessarily involved in it, and from giving to it a significance which it does not possess.

(1) First, it has to be noticed that the question of authorship is not identical with that of inspiration. Hence, when Dr. Miavart, in setting forth the results of modern Biblical criticism, treats together questions of authorship, date, and the veracity of the text, he may no doubt be acting in the manner best

calculated to convey a clear idea of the subject to his readers ; but, from the standpoint of theology, he is mixing up matters, distinct in themselves, and not necessarily connected, even from the point of view of literary criticism. Thus, when we are told that the book of *Chronicles* is considered as a thoroughly un-historical work (certainly not older than 320 B.C.), the impression is naturally produced on our minds that the date and trustworthiness of the book are inseparably connected ; and, if we believe there is evidence for the date assigned, we are tempted to imagine that there must exist corresponding evidence for the other statement. In reality, the two questions are quite distinct, and of far different significance for Catholics. What then is our obligation in regard to the authorship of the books of sacred Scripture ?

M. Loisy, Professor of Theology in the Higher School of Theology in Paris, proposes the following question in his “*Histoire du Canon du Nouveau Testament*” (p. 251) :

Must we then say that the Council of Trent has defined the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews ? Is it of faith that our Gospel of St. Matthew is entirely the work of that apostle ; that the concluding verses of St. Mark, and the section concerning the woman taken in adultery, are not only parts of the canonical Scriptures, but also authentic parts of the Gospels, written by St. Mark and St. John : in a word, that all the books connected by the Council of Trent with the name of a person of the Old or New Testament are really theirs, and were written by them in the form in which we now have them ?

To this question he replies, that the naming of the authors of certain books of Scripture by the Council was certainly equivalent to a doctrinal precept. The authenticity of the sacred books, in the sense that they were written by the persons named, was proposed as a “safe” doctrine, to be adhered to in public teaching, and also, in a general way, to be received with internal assent, if there were no weighty reasons for dissenting from it ; but it was by no means promulgated as a formal infallible decree. “Authenticity,” says M. Loisy, “is not a fact of the same order as inspiration. The latter is a supernatural fact, the object of revelation, and known only by revelation. The former is in itself an historical fact, established and attested by human means.” Still, he points out

that authenticity and inspiration are connected with one another, and that hence the Church may at any time step in to settle questions of authorship.

Such being the case, what is to be said in regard to the question of the Mosaic authorship? For, obviously, the mere fact of no dogmatic utterance having been pronounced on the subject does not leave the field free for Catholics. Cardinal Newman concedes that "Moses may have incorporated in his manuscript as much from foreign documents as is commonly maintained by the critical school." Unfortunately, such a concession hardly touches the point at issue. With modern criticism, it is no mere question of incorporated documents; it is a revolution in our way of looking at the Pentateuch that is involved. The five books of the Law are regarded as the outcome of a growth which went on in ages long after Moses; they are the result of a series of editings and re-editings extending even to the Babylonian exile. They contain, perhaps, some Mosaic germs; though, it may be, not a line of the Pentateuch was written by Moses himself. In the face of such teaching, what is to be said of the Mosaic authorship?

The precept of a general Council, guiding the action of Catholics on the subject, cannot be left out of sight. And though, no doubt, freer scope is permitted to Catholics in these days, in discussing questions of authorship and authenticity, still such liberty must be used with prudence and caution. Nor is it right to set aside an opinion, handed down from the earliest ages of the Church, without clear and cogent necessity.

But, apart from the weight attaching to tradition upon the subject of the Mosaic authorship, there are other difficulties to be surmounted. There are our Lord's references to the Pentateuch, under the name of Moses, and there is the text of the Pentateuch itself. Are the words by which Jesus Christ refers to the Pentateuch inconsistent with non-Mosaic authorship? Clearly, the fact that our Saviour cited the Law, under the name of Moses, is an argument not lightly to be set aside; but it does not seem decisive of the point. Many reasons have been adduced by modern writers to show this. We would here suggest another, which may perhaps be worth notice. Can we be always certain by what exact form of expression our

Saviour named the Pentateuch in His quotations? Does inspiration extend so far as to guide the sacred writer to tell us whether our Lord referred to "the Law" or "the law of Moses," or simply "Moses"? Certainly, from the divergences already pointed out between different writers in narrating the same words of Jesus Christ, it would seem not; and if this be so, the argument loses much of its weight.

The most serious question to be considered, however, is the text of the Pentateuch itself. That Moses nowhere claims to have written more than certain portions of it may be true. But, then, does not the legislation, referred by modern critics to a comparatively recent date, claim to have been written in the time of the exodus? Are not some of the passages, clearly assigned to Moses by the Pentateuch, declared by the new school of interpreters to be of late origin? These and kindred questions seem to us to present the most serious obstacles to the rejection of the Mosaic authorship.

The question of the authorship of the Pentateuch is perhaps the most difficult of those, raised by modern criticism, regarding the authenticity of the books of sacred Scripture. The authority of a book in the Canon is not necessarily impaired, because we do not know the name of its author; and, as a matter of fact, the authors of many of the books of the Old Testament are unknown, as the books of *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Kings*, and *Chronicles*. Such being the case, it does not seem necessary that we should know, in every case, who wrote the various additions, fragments, and deutero-canonical parts in sacred Scripture. "It seems clear," says M. Loisy (p. 263), "that inspiration does not exclude the collaboration of several authors in the same work." Accordingly, the known and acknowledged inspiration of such passages as the concluding verses of St. Mark, and the account of the adulterous woman, does not settle the authorship of these passages. Apparently, the book of *Proverbs* is not entirely from one pen (Cornely); nor was the discourse of Elihu, in *Job*, necessarily written at the same time as the rest of the book. So, too, we may say of the deutero-canonical parts of *Esther* and *Daniel*, that they probably do not belong to the first redaction of these books. But whatever be the origin of these and similar passages, they are inspired; and moreover, it is to be presumed, that they

were written by those with whose names they are associated, unless there are grave and conclusive reasons for deciding otherwise.

Cardinal Newman lays down that it does not matter "whether one or two Isaiahs wrote the book which bears that prophet's name" (p. 196); and, indeed, it seems that of late many Catholic interpreters have held the divided authorship of that great prophecy; nor, apparently, can any objection be raised on the score of inspiration. In the case of most of the prophetical books, as Cornely* points out, they contain but a summary of the prophets' teaching. They were probably compiled by their authors, when advanced in life, and give only the substance of discourses delivered during a long series of years. No doubt, too, considerable freedom was exercised by the writers in arranging, altering, and adding to their discourses, so as to bring them in conformity with a definite plan.

(2) Besides distinguishing between authenticity and inspiration, it must be remembered that the words of Scripture cannot always be interpreted in the same way. St. Thomas, discussing the question whether Paradise is *locus corporeus* (Summa I. ques. 102), lays down as a principle that "in all matters which Scripture delivers, after the manner of historical narrative, we must hold as a fundamental fact, the truth of the history." With great deference we are compelled to say that Cardinal Newman seems to us to draw from these words a conclusion which they do not warrant. "In giving a rule or test of the truth of historical statements," he says, "he surely implies that there are, or at least that there may be, statements which do not embody—which do not profess to embody—historical truth." These are what the Cardinal would call *obiter dicta*.† It is obvious that St. Thomas implies that there are, or may be in Scripture, passages which do not embody historical truth. But he does not refer to *obiter dicta*, or passages which have not the guarantee of inspiration; it is to narratives in allegory, metaphor, parable, and the like that he refers. So that in the case under discussion the great theologian seems to us to be inquiring whether the account of

* Introduction, vol. ii. pp. 288 *et seq.*

† Postscript, pp. 17, 18.

Paradise given in *Genesis* is historical or allegorical ; for if the former, it must be taken literally as true.

It is clear that it is important for the interpreter to bear in mind the different styles of narrative in Scripture ; for one of the difficulties in explaining the earlier parts of the Old Testament is to distinguish accurately between what is historical and allegorical. So too it must not be forgotten that a considerable portion of the Old Testament is written in poetry, and that these passages are to be interpreted according to the rules of that kind of composition. For example, the two accounts given in the book of *Judges* (chaps. iv. and v.) of the deeds of Debbara and Barac, may be readily harmonised if it be borne in mind that the second narrative is written in poetry.

(3) Finally, the idea of inspiration, in its strictest sense, applies only to the original copies of sacred Scripture. Centuries have passed since the last page of the Bible was written ; the autographs of the inspired writers have long disappeared ; and we are left with copies of the Scriptures, made ages after the deaths of their authors. Moreover, the existing versions and codices of the sacred text differ much from one another, and errors in fact and chronology, as is admitted by all, have crept into the inspired volume. It is obvious, therefore, that it is of the utmost importance to know how far the idea of inspiration applies to the Bible, as we now have it, and where a genuine edition of sacred Scripture is to be found.

The Council of Trent has supplied an answer to both these questions, in declaring the Latin Vulgate to be "authentic," in the decree *De editione et usu sacrorum librorum*. Owing to the inconvenience caused by the great number of Latin versions which had appeared in recent years, and also because it seemed important to have one official text as a basis of pastoral and dogmatic teaching in the Church, the Council formulated this disciplinary enactment. But it must not be supposed that the declaration of the authenticity of the Latin Vulgate necessarily implies it to be the most accurate edition of sacred Scripture. It disparages neither the Septuagint nor the Hebrew ; nor does it imply that a new edition might not be prepared, more accurate than any now in existence. It merely

declares the Vulgate to be the official text of the Church. The decree, of course, implies in a general way and substantially, the conformity of the Vulgate with the original text; for, were the Vulgate substantially corrupt, the Council of Trent could not have adopted it as the official text of the Church. But, furthermore, this substantial conformity is guaranteed implicitly by the dogmatic decree on the canon, where it is said that we are to receive, as sacred and canonical, the entire books *as they are contained in the Latin Vulgate*.

Assured that there existed sufficient conformity [says M. Loisy (p. 258)] between the original Scriptures and the Vulgate, and that the latter did not contain any error in matters of faith and morals, so that it might be used as a basis for the ordinary teaching of the Church, the Council adopted the Vulgate, to the exclusion of more recent versions; but, on the other hand, knowing that the Vulgate had not been preserved free from all alteration, it expressed a wish that it be emended, and entrusted to the care of the Holy Father the execution of that work.

Then, discussing the possibility of the interpolation of dogmatic texts in the Vulgate, he continues:

Of this the Council was persuaded, that if such interpolations have been introduced, in the course of centuries, into the Latin Bible, they are not of such a kind as to modify or alter the doctrine contained in authentic texts; for the rest, it belongs to *savants* by profession to examine if such or such a verse, phrase, or part of a phrase, has been added, omitted, or altered in the Ecclesiastical Books.

Acting on these principles, M. Loisy does not hesitate to reject as interpolations the verse concerning the three heavenly witnesses, several verses in Ecclesiasticus (notably xxiv. 45), and the words of Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth" (xix. 25). He also holds that the words of Isaiah (xi. 10), "and His sepulchre shall be glorious," are a late emendation for "and his dwelling shall be glorious." Without expressing any opinion on the merits of M. Loisy's decision in regard to these particular passages, it is safe to say that considerable latitude is allowed by the Church to the student in dealing with the text of the Vulgate, provided he is acting on solid grounds.

Many Catholics are uneasy at the progress that is being made in science and history in these days, as if these branches of learning were destined to subvert the Word of God. Hence

a desire in some quarters to restrict the sphere of inspiration, and to attribute to much in Scripture a merely human authority. A restlessness and dread of what is coming prevails outside the Church of God ; it is not unnatural that some little of this anxiety should find its way inside the fold. But there is no reason to fear. With the assured results of science, Scripture can never be at variance. It is only the immature conclusions of faulty science that seem to clash with God's Word.

J. A. HOWLETT.

ART. IV.—SOME ENGLISH CROSSES.

MOST people have heard of the crosses at Iona, and have a vague idea that a king of England once lived who had a wife named Eleanor, to whose memory he erected crosses; but there are few persons even amongst the well-informed and cultivated classes who realise that in pre-Reformation times there was scarcely a village or hamlet in England which had not its cross; the memorial of the piety of an individual, or set up by some religious body. Many parishes had more than one, and it was by no means uncommon for the larger towns to have four or five; we know that at Liverpool there was the High Cross, the White Cross, and St. Patrick's Cross. The crosses of England may be divided into several classes.

There was the Churchyard Cross; this was almost invariably placed on the south side of the church; in some cases it was a magnificent piece of work, showing the sculptor's art in all its glory, but more usually it was comparatively small and plain. These crosses continued to be multiplied in number down to the period of the Reformation; it must be remembered that there were few ways in the Middle Ages by which a man could spend money in charity with the (to him) absolute certainty of doing the good that the erection of crosses offered. When the great outburst of iconoclastic zeal took place in the sixteenth century, more than two-thirds of the crosses in England were destroyed, in some cases orders were issued that they should be torn down by the powers that were; in others, the mayors of towns and chief people in the country parishes did it to mark their devotion to the tenets of the reformed religion, and as an unmistakable setting forth of the fact that they had abjured the errors of Rome. Nor was this wholesale destruction confined to the churchyard crosses only; the Puritan spirit then dominant, was, for ends of their own, fanned by Elizabeth and her advisers; anything that could serve to turn the minds of men away from the un-reformed Church was eagerly welcomed; crosses were an outward and visible sign of the devotion that had existed, and to a great extent still remained,

towards Catholicism ; therefore they were condemned. It was on the part of the great mass of Puritan enthusiasts merely a misdirected sense of right that led them to demolish whatever they considered savoured of Romanism ; on the part of the Crown and the high officials it was a well-considered move in the game they were playing. The Queen and her councillors were far too enlightened to object to crosses, but in their eyes the necessities of the case demanded their destruction.

The upheaval of the Reformation confused men's minds ; they were stunned by the shock, and never realised until it was too late what the real aim of those in power was. At heart the great body of the people remained Catholic, they conformed outwardly, but Puritanism never killed the Catholic spirit in England, though by destroying so much that was not only beautiful but symbolic, the lives of the people were rendered to a great extent blank.

The Anglo-Saxon crosses usually had the Crucifixion carved on them. It was the custom at that time to erect the church-yard cross either near to the south doorway of the church or by the side of the pathway which led to it, so that the pious might be reminded at all times as they entered or left the building by the sight of Our Saviour upon the Cross, to pray for the souls of those whose bodies were mouldering below the grass at their feet.

Occasionally these churchyard crosses were called "Palm Crosses," because on Palm Sunday it formed a station in the Procession of the Blessed Sacrament ; also after the Passion had been recited at Mass on that day, blessed palms were brought out, and the cross was decked with them. Most likely these palm wreaths remained on the cross until either very late on the following Thursday, or early on Good Friday morning, when no doubt they would be removed. Henry Bunn, in his will, 1501, ordered a cross to be set up in Hardley Churchyard "pro palmis in die ramis palmarum offerendis."*

The ceremonies at the cross on Palm Sunday were common also in France and Germany. It was not only acts of religious ceremonial which took place at the cross, many civil functions were performed there. Formerly the mayors of Folkestone

* Bloomfield's "Norfolk," x. 141, edit. 1809.

assembled the electors to meet them at the churchyard cross on the eighth of September, in order to choose the mayor for the following term of office. It must have been an imposing sight; the sign that the hour had arrived to proceed to the meeting-place was given by the blowing of a horn.* This horn now hangs over the mayor's seat in the Town Hall.

When all were assembled, the mayor addressed them and bade them go into the chancel of the church and there elect the new mayor, which was then done. Whether they again returned to the cross we do not know. The Manor Court of Aston Rogers, Shropshire, met at the cross.

The crosses at Sandbach in Cheshire are considered to be older than any in England, but they do not stand in the churchyard; they are held by authorities to date from the eighth century, and some even consider them not to be later than the seventh. They are too well known to need any description. There seems to be no reason why they should not last for the next thousand years; the stone of which they are made is the Lower Silurian formation, and is practically indestructible by weather or time. It is by no means an uncommon thing to find the bases of churchyard crosses yet remaining, and at times they are dug up by the sexton. Half the stone into which the base of the cross had been fitted, was dug up about forty years ago in the churchyard of Northorpe, Lincolnshire, but it was destroyed at the time, or very soon afterwards. At Bottesford, in the same county, the base of the cross remains in its original position on the southern side of the churchyard, about forty or fifty feet from the church; the cross itself is still fixed firmly in its place, but it has evidently been taken up at some time and the column considerably shortened, and then put back again; at the present time it is only about three feet high. The object of thus shortening it seems to have been that a sun-dial might be placed on the top. The head

* At Ripon the badge of the Wakeman (mayor as he has been called since the Municipal Reform Act) is a very old horn, the baldric of which is decorated with little silver ornaments given to it by the various Wakemen; some of these appear to be very ancient. Another large horn is blown every evening in front of the mayor's house, and at what is known as the Market Cross, an Egyptian-like obelisk which stands in the market-place, and which no doubt occupies the place where the market cross once stood. An engraving of the Wakeman's Horn may be seen in Walbran's "Guide to Ripon."

of the cross has been roughly levelled to admit of this being done. The holes in the stone show where it was attached, but the dial itself has long since ceased to mark the drawing nearer of eternity.

The east of England is much poorer in crosses than the west, but Lincolnshire can boast of one which is said to be unique, and is by some people considered to be the most graceful churchyard cross in Britain. It stands in the churchyard of Somersby, near Louth, celebrated as being the birthplace of Tennyson. The beautiful octagonal column springs from broaches which rest upon a square base, it is fifteen feet high, and is surmounted by an embattled triangle, the top of the shaft having also an embattled head. There is no tradition by whom, or for what purpose, it was erected; we do not know whether it was meant to keep in the memory of men some one who rests near it and who has been forgotten these four hundred years, or whether it is a "Weeping Cross," or only the ordinary churchyard cross. There is a good account of it to be found in "Ancient Stone Crosses of England," by Alfred Rimmer. There is a curious custom connected with the churchyard cross at Stringston, in Somersetshire. A writer in the *Ecclesiologist* for 1844* says, "Until very lately it was the custom of the people of Stringston to do obeisance to the churchyard cross."†

In many parts of England the old feeling of reverence had never died out, but I do not at this moment recollect another instance of the peasantry paying honour to the cross, so late as the middle of the present century. At Ampthill, in Bedfordshire, there is in the vestry of the church a most interesting fragment of the old cross which no doubt once stood in the churchyard there. It has on it, on one side, the Crucifixion, which is very general; on the other, Our Lady, crowned, which is unusual.

Some writers have spoken as though crosses were never erected in churchyards after the Reformation, and no doubt it was rarely done, but we have positive evidence that it was

* iv. 291.

† Sixty years ago, at Kirton-in-Lindsey, Lincolnshire, the old men used to give a pull at their forelocks, towards the altar, on coming into and leaving the church, and the old women curtsied towards it.

occasionally allowed. The following inscription upon the cross in the churchyard of Fyfield, Berks, is an instance in point :

This cross was erected
in the yeare 1627
at the expence of
WM. UPTON, esq.*

Wayside crosses are believed not to have been so common in England as they are at the present day in some parts of Spain and Italy, but there were undoubtedly an immense number of them. There are probably more remaining now in Gloucestershire, Somersetshire, Wiltshire, Devonshire, and Cornwall than in all the rest of England put together. There were several reasons for the erection of these emblems of Christianity, but no doubt the chief one was that so quaintly expressed in a kind of commentary on the ten commandments, "Dives et Pauper," printed by Wynken de Worde, at Westminster, in 1496. The author tells us that "for this reason ben crosses by ye waye, that whan folke passyng see the crosses they sholde thynke on Hym that dyed on the crosse and worshyppe Hym above all thynge."

It was also a practice to set them up on the spot where a murder had taken place, and is commonly done in Spain to this day.

They were often erected in positions suitable for funerals to rest at. The body was placed at the foot of the cross, and the mourners rested and prayed for the soul of the departed. Archbishop Grindal † issued an injunction against resting with corpses at crosses on the way to burial.‡

There is a very ancient cross at Lancaster, with the following Runic inscription upon it :

Pray for Cynibald the son of Cuthbert.§

In Ely Cathedral is the base of a cross that was formerly at Heddenham, commemorating the steward of Etheldreda (he seems to have died about 680). The following is the inscription upon it :

* *Gents. Mag. Lib.*, Topog. i. 156.

† Edmund Grindal, Bishop of London; Archbishop of York. 1570; Archbishop of Canterbury, 1575-6.

‡ Parker Soc. Index, 255.

§ *Archæological Journal*, iii. 72.

✠ Lucem . Tuam . Ovino .
 Da . . Deus . Et . Requiē .
 Amen.*

There is the fragment of an ancient cross to be seen close to Doncaster, with an inscription upon it in Norman French :

✠ ICEST: EST: LA: CRVICE: OTE: D: TILLI:
 A: KI: ALME: DEV: EN: FAICE: MERCI:
 A. M.

Tradition says that this cross was destroyed by the troops of the Earl of Manchester, either on their way to or as they came from the battle of Marston Moor. If there be any truth in the story, it would be most likely to have taken place on the return march southwards. The Parliamentary general was in a great hurry on his way to the north, and, however much their zeal against signs and symbols might lead the Puritan soldiers under him to desire to pause and demolish any work of art that lay in their line of march, it is very unlikely that they would have been allowed to waste valuable time by doing so at that juncture.

Near Cambridge once stood a wayside cross, asking the prayers of the passers-by for one Evrard :

Quisquis es Eurardi memor esto Bechensis, et ora
 Liber ut ad requiem transeat absque mora.†

Certain crosses seem to have been objects of devotion to various trades or professions. The cross at Kings Weston, Gloucestershire, stood near the Severn, and was an object of great reverence to sailors. After returning from a voyage they visited it, to give thanks for being brought home in safety, and before they again sailed to pray that they might return in prosperity.

Wayside crosses, besides being memorials of some person or event, or objects of especial devotion to some class of people, were often used as meeting-places. There is a local tradition which says that the base of a mediæval cross raised on octagonal steps, which yet remains, half way between York and Fulford, a village about a mile and a half to the south of

* *Rock*, "The Church of Our Fathers," vol. iii. part i. 18.

† Leland's "Collectanea," ii. 438.

York, was used as a place of meeting between the townsfolk and the country people during the Plague in 1665. That it was so used during the cholera in 1833 we know. Those who had market produce of any kind to dispose of, placed their goods on the steps, and when the bargains were concluded, the purchasers in their turn laid the money there, so that none needed to touch each other. There can be but little doubt that the crosses destroyed at the Reformation far exceeded in number those that remained, but the Civil War between Charles I. and his Parliament, attended as it was by an outburst of fanatical zeal, caused many to be demolished which had weathered the greater storm of the preceding century. Many things of interest suffered from the vandalism of the ignorant soldiery, and crosses being considered emblems of Popery, were very hardly dealt with. Over the greater part of England where the tradition exists that any work of art was destroyed from 1642 to 1658, it is stated, and firmly believed to have been caused by, or at least received the sanction, of Cromwell. In some few instances there seems to be evidence that he did allow it, but in most cases he never was near the place either then or at any other time. Unfortunately the crosses in the west of England have suffered in more recent days from another cause. It was by no means an uncommon thing for the farmers in the eighteenth century, and even till within living memory, to use them for gate posts. This was perhaps more done in Cornwall and Devonshire than anywhere else, but the neighbouring counties can, alas ! show specimens of this wanton destruction. The crosses usually to be met with in the western part of the island are oblong blocks of granite, generally with a flat circular top, on one side a Latin cross, on the other usually a rough sculpture representing the Crucifixion. In some instances we find the Latin cross replaced by the Greek one, but this is rarely to be met with. These crosses vary much in size ; while some are nearly eight feet high, others appear only a foot above the ground. It is believed there is no Cornish cross with any inscription upon it, save one, the Market Cross at Penzance. It is said the following inscription is concealed at the bottom of the shaft :

Hic procumbunt corpora plorum.*

* Halliwell, "Rambles in Western Cornwall," p. 29.

The west of England must have been wonderfully rich in crosses ; there are five remaining at the present time in the parish of Lelant in Cornwall. At St. Erth in the same county the cross has a square head, an unusual feature in that part of the country, the heads of the crosses there being nearly all of them circular. Many of these heads have four round holes in them ; when this occurs they are usually named “ Four Hole Crosses.”

Norfolk possesses several crosses in a fair state of preservation. One of the best among them is that in Langley Park ; it consists of a single shaft ; the ornamental carvings upon it are very beautiful, and it is in a wonderfully good repair. Very early in the present century Sir Thomas Proctor removed it from its original site near to the Abbey, and placed it where it now stands, to mark where the parishes of Langley, Chedgrave, and Thurlton meet. In the removal the shaft was unfortunately broken, but it was mended when the cross was once more set up ; it is a great pity that it was ever taken from its place, but to put it back might be dangerous, as again the shaft might break. Mr. Samuel Whitbread, the great grandfather of the present Member of Parliament for Bedford, erected a wayside cross at Cardington in that county, in the centre of the three roads which lead to Bedford, St. Neots, and Cardington. This is a late instance of such a cross being erected before the present revival. Many of the wayside crosses were set up as boundary marks, and they are often alluded to in old chartularies. When by far the greater part of the country was unenclosed, such marks were necessary, and a natural instinct of piety dictated the form. It would be difficult to say why the east of England suffered more than the southern and more westerly parts of the island by having these memorials destroyed. The city of Lincoln is an example of this. We know Remigius built a cross there ; he was succeeded by Hugh de Grenoble, who erected two if not more in the city, and from time to time we hear of others ; all have perished ; St. Mary’s Cross, so called, being a conduit.

Weeping Crosses were crosses that had either been expressly set up as stations at which to do penance, or those used as such. They must have been very common, for “ to return home by weeping cross ” became a proverb, and signified that the

individual about whom such a remark was made had failed in something, in the success of which he was deeply interested, or had in some way or other been very unfortunate.

He that goes out with often losse,
At last comes home by Weeping Cross,*

seems to indicate that the expression was generally meant to indicate that a person had had a series of misfortunes in his business or calling in life.

This phrase seems to have lasted as late as till the middle of the eighteenth century.

Ozel,† in his translation of Brantome's "Spanish Rhodomontades" (2nd edit. 1774, p. 56), says: "Making an eruption into Provence, he came home by weeping cross."

The Weeping Cross at Shrewsbury was one of the stations on Corpus Christi Day; the various guilds and corporations visited it, and there offered up prayers for a good harvest. There is a road outside Salisbury named "King John's Lane," leading from Clarendon to Old Sarum; it is crossed by another road, and at this point there is a clump of elm-trees. These trees are known as "the weeping cross trees." There can be but little doubt that on this spot a Weeping Cross once stood, and the memory of it is handed down to us in this manner, though in all likelihood it perished more than three hundred years ago; but let a name or a tradition once take firmly hold of the hearts and minds of the people, and it dies hard. As will be seen later on, it seems to have been the custom to plant trees in the place of the cross when it was demolished. I have been informed that on some maps this clump of elms is called "Whipping Cross Tree," which is evidently a corruption. There is, however, a very curious instance of the way in which, what may be termed modern myths, are evolved, to be found in connection with this place. It is stated, and no doubt truly, that the London coach stopped here to pick up passengers, and that their

* Hazlitt's "Eng. Prov.," p. 3.

† John Ozel. He was the translator of many French, Italian, and Spanish books, amongst the rest of "Don Quixote," and the works of Rabelais and Molière. Pope alluded to him somewhat unfavourably in "The Dunciad," whereupon he drew a comparison between the poet and himself, by no means in favour of the former.

friends usually accompanied them to the starting-point; and as, in the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth century, a journey from Salisbury to London was not a thing to be lightly undertaken, the partings that took place here were often of a tearful and melancholy kind, hence the name "Weeping Cross," for they wept where the roads crossed each other. Such is history.

Near Islip Church, Oxfordshire, is to be seen a large elm-tree, its root surrounded by stones; this is known as "The Cross Tree," but whether it was a Weeping Cross, or merely a Wayside Cross, we have no means of knowing.

There is a Weeping Cross near Holywell in Flintshire. The Welsh name for it means the Cross of Mourning.* Weeping Crosses must have been numerous; there is one yet remains near Stafford, and there was one formerly between Banbury and Adderbury.

Preaching Crosses were places where sermons were delivered by the preaching friars and other ecclesiastics. There was, until about twenty years ago, an old sycamore-tree in the village street at Messingham, in Lincolnshire; it was named "The Cross Tree," and no doubt occupied the place where the cross once stood. Did John Wesley realise, as standing beneath it he preached to the crowds that flocked to hear him, that, as the shadow of the sycamore fell upon him, so on that very spot had the shadow of the cross fallen centuries before, upon those who then spoke to the ancestors of the men and women listening to him, of things spiritual and the life eternal to come?

When the old tree died, a young one of the same kind was planted in its place, and is also known as "The Cross Tree." St. Paul's Cross was one of the most celebrated of the preaching crosses, not only of England, but of Europe; what it may have been like at first we have no means of knowing, but in later days it was a pulpit of wood, raised on a flight of stone steps, and covered with lead. The citizens of London formerly held their meetings at it, and it is associated with many historical events, the memories of which yet remain with us. In the reign of Richard III., Jane Shore did penance before it.

* Rimmer, "Ancient Stone Crosses of England," chap. i. p. 14.

It was in front of this cross that Cardinal Wolsey sat in state to hear fulminations against the doctrines of Luther, and it was here that, by the orders of Henry VIII., sermons were delivered to the wondering crowds in favour of the Reformation. Hither came Queen Elizabeth in 1588 to attend a service of solemn thanksgiving for the defeat of the Spanish Armada. Sermons continued to be preached here, more or less irregularly, until 1643, when, by the orders of the Parliament, it was demolished along with various objects of interest. The destruction of crosses, glass, and the many other monuments of bygone ages occasioned much ill-feeling, and there still remain some of the satires written at the time; the following is a specimen of verse of the better sort that was written to bring the spoilers of sacred things into contempt in the eyes of the people :

They plukt communion-tables down, and broke our painted glasses,
 They threw our altars to the ground, and tumbled down the crosses;
 They set up Cromwell and his heir, the Lord and Lady Claypole,
 Because they hated common-prayer, the organ, and the may-pole.*

Bishop Percy refers to Whitelock's statement, under the date May 3, 1643, that Cheapside and other crosses were ordered to be pulled down by a vote of Parliament, but this order was not carried out so far as Charing Cross was concerned until the summer of 1647.†

In his "Relics" [ii. 331] Bishop Percy prints an amusing account of the destruction of Charing Cross; it commences thus :

Undone, undone, the lawyers are,
 They wander about the towne,
 Nor can find the way to Westminster,
 Now Charing Cross is downe;
 At the end of the Strand, they make a stand,
 Swearing they are at a loss,
 And chaffing say, that's not the way,
 They must go by Charing Cross.

There are six verses in the poem, and perhaps the one already quoted and the fifth are the best. The latter is

* Thomas Jordan, "A royal Arbor of loyall Poesie," 1663. Jordan wrote an immense number of books and pamphlets. He has been called "the professed pageant writer and poet-laureat for the city."

† "Relics of Ancient English Poetry," ed. 1794, ii. 333.

interesting, as showing that the destruction of crosses was general :

The committee said, that verily,
 To popery it was bent,
 For aught I know, it might be so,
 For to church it never went.
 What with excise, and such device,
 The kingdom doth begin
 To think you'll leave them ne'er a cross
 Without doors nor within.

A beautiful specimen of a Preaching Cross at Hereford escaped the fate of so many others, and is still to be seen in the Dominican Priory there. Preaching crosses may yet be found at the Cathedrals of Norwich and Worcester, on the north side. It is said St. Oswald used to preach at the cemetery cross at Worcester, but I do not know the evidence for this belief. There are other specimens of preaching crosses to be seen, we know of the existence of many that have perished, and there must have been numbers of others of which no tradition, written or unwritten, now remains.

Market crosses were to be found in the Middle Ages in almost all towns, they were generally placed in the centre of the cross streets, and were no doubt intended as places of shelter for those attending the market. The usual form was a vaulted structure, with opening at the sides and cross on the top. They varied much in size, shape, and detail. Fine examples yet remain at Chichester, Malmesbury, Elgin, Glastonbury, Shepton Malet in Somersetshire, Salisbury, and other places.

Some people consider the Market Cross at Chichester to be the finest specimen now left in Britain; it is certainly one of the most elaborate. It was built by Edward Storey, who was translated from the see of Carlisle to that of Chichester in 1478. It was restored during the reign of Charles II. by the Duke of Richmond.*

Ipswich could once boast of a very interesting old market cross, but, to the everlasting disgrace of those who authorised such an act of vandalism, it was destroyed early in this cen-

* Rimmer, "Ancient Stone Crosses of England," 1875, chap. v. p. 62.

tury. On the summit was a colossal figure of a woman holding a pair of scales. As far as I am aware, there is but one other instance of this in England. Coventry Cross has the figure of Justice at the top, holding a pair of scales also. There is little doubt that these figures were intended to typify the fact that just dealing ought to reign below. Malmesbury Market Cross is in very good preservation. Leland gives an account of it. Market Crosses served a double purpose: the seller looked upon the cross and swore that what he offered was honestly come by and good, and this supplied the place of a voucher.* The Market Cross at Shepton Mallet, Somersetshire, is one of the best examples that yet remain. It was erected in 1505, by one Walter Buckland and Agnes, his wife.†

In addition to the Market Cross, each town usually had a High Cross, at whose foot public meetings were held, proclamations made, and much civil business transacted. If there were no High Cross, such things were then, as a rule, done at the Market Cross. Macaulay alludes to this in his account of the Mayor of Plymouth, in "The Armada" raising the standard,

His yeomen round the market cross make clear an ample space,
For there behoves him to set up the standard of Her Grace.

We find that in 1529 the play of "Robert Cecill" was performed at the High Cross, at Chester, and that it was newly gilded, most likely in honour of the event. In 1583, Nicholas Massy, sheriff, "being a godly zealous man," not long before his death, pulled down certain Crosses there by command of the Archbishop's‡ visitors—one at the Barrs, one at Northgate, and another at Spittal Boughton.§ There was also a cross somewhere near to St. Michael's Church.

There is a meadow on the west side of the city, called the Roodee. In former days, when the tide rose it was covered with water, with the exception of a small island, on which stood a Cross, or Holy Rood. A writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, in 1807,|| speaking of Chester, says, "The only remains of any cross

* Southey, "Com. Pl. Bk." iii. 139.

† Rimmer, "Ancient Stone Crosses of England." 1875, ix. 113.

‡ Edward Sandys, elected Jan. 25, 1577-8, died at Southwell, July 10, 1588.

§ *Gents. Mag. Lib.*, Topog. part ii. 117.

|| *Ibid.*, 1807, part i. p. 313.

[No. 7 of Fourth Series.]

at this time here, is upon the Roode where races are run." The High Cross escaped the fate of most of the other crosses in the city in 1583, but was torn down by the Puritan soldiers in the following century. In 1804 the remains were discovered buried in the porch of St. Peter's Church, and were taken to Netterleigh House, and there used to form a kind of ornamental rock work in the gardens. They are now restored to their original position, and Chester High Cross once more looks down on the busy life of the city lying below it.

Melton Mowbray had two crosses ; they seem to have been placed at the two principal entrances to the town. The following interesting mention of them occurs in an old minute book belonging to the town :

1584 Itm. The stock stone at Thorpe Crosse was sold to John Wythers for tow shillings and tow pence, and to plante or sett one Ashe tree, or a thorne, and to renewe the same till yt please god theye grow.

Itm. The stocke stone at Kettelbye Crosse wt one stone standing, is sold to Willm Trigge for fyve shillings and he to sett a Tree and husbond yt till yt growe as abovesaid.

The crosses in Scotland do not seem to have been so elaborate as they were in England, not infrequently they had the unicorn on the summit. The High Cross of Edinburgh stood in the middle of the High Street. It was removed in 1617, a royal pageant then being organised to welcome home James VI. on his first visit to his northern capital after he had succeeded to the English throne ; and it was thought the cross would obstruct the royal procession. So far as I am aware there has been no list compiled of the crosses that yet remain in Britain. The crosses of some districts have been accurately and fully described ; and scattered about in various periodicals and the transactions of learned societies there is much valuable information to be obtained on the subject, but what is really needed is an exhaustive list of the crosses of Britain, arranged under the counties. A short account of each cross should be given, and especial care ought to be taken to record the existence of the bases or fragments of any kind that are still to be found.

It ought not to be difficult to get some resident in each county to undertake this, the larger counties being sub-divided again, and the result of their investigations forwarded to some

zealous antiquary who would undertake to direct the whole proceeding, and edit the book. Surely some one might be found at once capable of, and with leisure enough, to undertake this most needful compilation. The bells of many counties have been fully described and chronicled; in others the church plate has been made the subject of investigation; the crosses have not been so fortunate, but it is earnestly to be hoped that they may ere long receive the attention they most certainly merit.

FLORENCE PEACOCK.

ART. V.—THE EARLY GALLICAN LITURGY.

PART I.

AT a time when so much is being done in various ways, both at home and abroad, for the reconstruction of liturgical history on a sound basis, it is, perhaps, hardly necessary to apologise for an attempt to throw some light on a branch of the subject which, in England at least, does not appear to have received a due share of attention. In this and a subsequent paper I propose to give some account of the early Gallican or Hispano-Gallican Liturgy, to point out one or two features of this Liturgy which seem to have escaped the notice of previous writers on the subject, and to give some reasons for referring it to a Roman rather than to a distinctively Eastern origin. The subject may also afford an opportunity for saying a few words in vindication of the part taken by the Popes in forwarding or urging the final abandonment of the Gallican and Spanish or Monastic rite in favour of the Roman Liturgy and liturgical system, in the matured form in which it had been left by St. Gelasius and St. Gregory the Great.

By the early Gallican or Hispano-Gallican Liturgy I understand that form of the eucharistic ritual which prevailed in Gaul from about the close of the fourth to about the middle of the eighth century, and in Spain from about the middle of the fifth century to the end of the eleventh. It has seemed best thus to define an initial epoch, partly because what little we know of the liturgical history of earlier times rests upon more or less uncertain inferences, and partly because there is reason to believe that at a time not far removed from the dates which I have specified a very important change was effected in the primitive eucharistic rite—viz., the introduction of a system of variable prayers and formulæ suitable to the successive festivals and changing seasons of the liturgical year.* Within the

* Dr. Probst has set forth at considerable length the reasons which lead him to the conclusion that this change took place in Rome rather sooner than in Gaul, and in Gaul somewhat earlier than in Spain, in his valuable paper, *Die Spanische Messe, &c.*, in the *Ztschr. f. k. T.*, 1888. It has been commonly

limits of time thus marked out, documents which are still extant enable us to form a sufficiently correct general notion of the course of liturgical development or decay.

The assumption that one and the same rite prevailed in Gaul and in Spain, at least within these limits of time, rests in part upon the testimony of a letter of Charles the Bald, quoted by Bona and Mabillon, but since lost, in which that king relates how, wishing to know what sort of Liturgy was formerly in use in his own dominions, summoned some priests from Toledo and commanded them to celebrate Mass in his presence according to the rite of that Church.* Much more important, however, than this letter is the circumstance that the liturgical remains of the two countries reveal beyond the possibility of question an almost complete identity of structure which a few differences in minor details can hardly even obscure.

It has been held by many Anglican writers, though not exclusively by them, that the origin of the Hispano-Gallican rite is to be sought at Ephesus, in the School of St. John the Evangelist. Thence it is supposed to have been brought to Lyons, whence it is thought to have gradually spread over the whole of Gaul and of the Spanish peninsula. And so confidently has this view been held that, as if it were a demonstrated truth, the term "Ephesine" has been freely used to designate the Liturgy in question.†

Now it is not, I think, too much to say that the antecedent improbabilities of this Ephesine hypothesis are so great that nothing short of an almost overwhelming array of evidence,

supposed that the Gallican rite maintained its supremacy in Gaul down to the time of Charlemagne. Dom S. Bäumer has shown that it had begun to give place to the Roman Liturgy long before that time. To this point I hope to return in the second and concluding portion of this paper.

* Bona, *de Rebus Liturgicis*, lib. i. c. 12 : Mabillon, *de Liturgia Gallicana* in Migne *P. L.* lxxii. 122. I know not on what grounds Dr. Swainson (*The Greek Liturgies*, p. xxxiv.) speaks of Mabillon as having seen this letter. He seems to have merely taken it from Bona. Where the latter found it, or what has become of it since, no one knows.

† Mr. Hammond (*Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. lxii.) has wisely avoided this nomenclature, and prefers the term "Hispano-Gallican," as resting on an assured basis of fact. Even he, however, on grounds which I will presently indicate, thinks that "it is not unreasonable to claim some connection with Ephesus for this group of Liturgies." I take this opportunity of thanking Mr. Hammond for the loan of his valuable work, which is out of print, and not easily obtainable.

whether internal or external, ought to be sufficient to gain acceptance for it.

Every liturgiological student is or should be familiar with the thesis, laid down by Dr. Probst as fundamental, that previous to the close of the third century—beyond which period Ephesus can hardly be thought to have exercised any special influence on the Churches of the West—the primitive Apostolic Liturgy had not as yet developed into distinct local rites. But without placing unreserved confidence in this view, we may at least admit that it would be strange indeed if this supposed Ephesine Liturgy, whose very existence is so problematical, and of which no trace is known to have survived in the East, should have taken so firm a root in Gaul, and should have imposed itself for centuries on so large a section of the Western Church. Nor is there, it may be said with confidence, a single shred of positive historical testimony, on which any reliance can be placed, to the effect that such was indeed the case. The words of an anonymous writer of the seventh or eighth century, quoted in Spelman's *Concilia*, have indeed been quoted in this connection.

Iohannes Evangelista primum cursum Gallorum cantavit. Inde postea Beatus Polycarpus discipulus sancti Johannis. Inde postea Hiereneus qui fuit Episcopus Lugdunensis Gallei (*sic*), tertius ipse cursum decantavit in Galleis.*

But apart from the fact that this writer here speaks not of the liturgy, but of the divine office (*cursus*), the whole passage in which this sentence occurs is so full of wild improbabilities, and of perversions of known facts, that it really ought not to find a place in any serious historical argument.† Much stress has also been laid on the 19th canon of the Council of Ladoicea, held in A.D. 372, which prescribes a liturgy identical in its main features with that which is still in use in the Greek

* *Concilia*, p. 176. Sir W. Palmer (*Origines Liturgicæ*, i. 157) couples with this testimony the words of Abbot Hilduin, who, writing in the ninth century, speaks of the suppressed Gallican Liturgy as having prevailed in Gaul from the introduction of Christianity (*ibid.* p. 145). Did then all Christianity in Gaul radiate from Lyons?

† If his authority is good for the statement quoted above, it should have no less weight when he says that Trophimus and Photinus, the latter a disciple of St. Peter and Bishop of Lyons, “cursum Romanum in Galleis tradiderunt.” He is careful to give his authority: “Sicut et refert Josephus (who was he?) et Eusebius Cæsariensis Episcopus”(!) This specimen may be enough.

Church.* But when it is inferred that this decree implies the previous use of a different type of liturgy, and when it is further argued that this suppressed liturgy was no other than that Ephesine rite to which the Gallican is supposed to have owed its origin, it is impossible not to feel that conjecture is being carried just a little too far for the requirements of sober historical research.†

Antecedently the probabilities are surely in favour of the supposition that as the Churches of Gaul and Spain for the most part derived their origin from Rome, so also they received, or rather brought, their Liturgy from thence; and I hope to show in the course of these pages that the points in which the early Gallican differed from the Roman rite are by no means such as to preclude the hypothesis of a Roman origin.‡

It must be remembered, however, that in claiming a Roman origin for the Gallican Liturgy, the matter in question is the *structure* of that Liturgy rather than the actual verbal contents of Gallican missals and sacramentaries. To state the matter somewhat more precisely, the question of the origin of particular prayers and liturgical formulae arises chiefly in connection with that portion of the Mass which is invariable, and which in the Roman rite is called the Canon; while as regards the variable elements, we are concerned rather with their order and arrangement, and with their general character and purport, than with the special wording of individual prayers. The ablest defenders of the Ephesine hypothesis have freely admitted that a very large proportion of the Gallican collects have been taken bodily from Roman sacramentaries; but, on the other hand, the staunchest supporter of the Roman origin of the Gallican rite must acknowledge that a very large number, perhaps a

* Hardouin, *Concilia*, i. 783, 784.

† Palmer (pp. 106-110) makes the most of this canon. And Mr. Hammond writes: "There are reasons arising out of a consideration of the 19th Canon of the Council of Laodicea for thinking that an order of Liturgy different from the type afterwards current in Asia Minor, and resembling the Gallican in some respects, had up to that time prevailed in those western parts of Asia Minor of which Ephesus was the principal church" (*Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. lxii., lxiii.—Italics mine).

‡ It cannot indeed be urged that the words of St. Innocent I., writing to Decentius of Gubbio, wherein he asserts that *all* the churches of Italy, Spain, Gaul, Sicily, and Africa, owed their origin to Rome, are of decisive authority, but they are at least of greater weight than inferences based on the testimony of Hilduin, or than the historical exercitations of the anonymous writer in Spelman.

majority, of these prayers were composed in Gaul or in Spain. We have indeed the most explicit historical testimony as to the composition of many Masses and liturgical prayers by Gallican and Spanish writers of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries.* But just as the almost yearly addition of new Masses and offices in our own day does not substantially alter the character of the Roman Breviary and Missal, so neither the composition of numerous Masses, nor even the wholesale borrowing of individual prayers from Roman service-books in the fifth and following centuries, necessarily affected the structure of the Gallican Mass; and—which is more to our present purpose—the recognition of these facts in no way affects the question whether in a still earlier age, the Gallican rite in its primitive form came from Ephesus or from Rome.†

The true relation of the Gallican to the Roman Liturgy may I believe be stated somewhat as follows. In the days when the first Christian missionaries travelling along the great Roman roads carried with them into Gaul and Spain the primitive eucharistic ritual which was at that time common to Rome with the Churches of the East, this ritual contained, as the Liturgies of the East to this day contain, no variable prayers; but one and the same unchanging formula—probably the same in substance which has been preserved for us in the eighth Book of the Apostolical Constitution—was employed in every celebration of the sacred mysteries. In course of time, however, under the watchful and active influence of the Roman Pontiffs, this primitive rite underwent in Rome a process of develop-

* Two instances must suffice. Gennadius (*de Viris Illustribus*, c. 79) says of Musæus of Marseilles: "Excerpsit ex sacris Scripturis Lectiones totius anni festivis aptas diebus, responsoria etiam psalmorum," &c., and that later, "composuit sacramentorum et non parvum volumen"—i.e., a sacramentary, containing, as Gennadius goes on to say, suitable prayers and prefaces, or "contestations." St. Isidore says of Peter of Lerida: "Edidit diversis solennitatibus congruentes orationes et missas eleganti sensu et aperto sermone" (*De Viris Illustribus*, c. 15). Peter probably lived in the fifth century (Probst in *Ztschr. f. k. T.*, 1888, p. 13).

† Sir W. Palmer has well expressed the distinction between the structure of a liturgy and the actual contents of liturgical books. "We are not to suppose, when we are informed that Musæus, Sidonius, and Hilary composed books of sacraments, *missæ*, or mysteries, that they effected any change in the liturgy of Gaul. In ecclesiastical writings such expressions imply nothing more than the composition of a variety of collects and prayers for the various feast days," &c. (*Origines Liturgicæ*, i. 147.) Those, however, who first substituted variable for fixed formulæ must be considered to have made a distinctly new departure.

ment, of reconstruction, and at the same time of curtailment, the particulars of which can be brought, roughly speaking, under two heads. In the first place, the daily or weekly repetition of the original unchanging prayers gradually gave place to a liturgical system in which variable collects as well as variable lessons, antiphons, and other formulæ marked the successive seasons and festivals of the ecclesiastical year.* It would occupy too much space to set forth here the reasons which have led Dr. Probst to the conclusion that the initiative in this phase of the process of liturgical reform is to be ascribed to St. Damasus. I must be content to note that the introduction of special or "proper" Masses is intimately connected with the system of liturgical *stations* or solemn assemblies at the tombs of the martyrs, and that with the organisation of this system the name of St. Damasus is honourably and inseparably linked.[†] Secondly, certain portions of the primitive liturgy were abbreviated, eliminated, or transposed, with a view, as it would seem, to the altered requirements of a time when churches were multiplied and private Masses became usual. To the first of these changes the Liturgies of the Eastern and Greek Churches, which have never possessed variable collects, unanimously testify; presenting as they do,

* We learn from the *Peregrinatio S. Silvie* that a system of variable *Antiphons* and lessons had come into use in the Church of Jerusalem while such a system, it would seem, was still unknown in Gaul. More than once the pilgrim expresses her surprise and delight at the skill with which lessons and chants were selected to suit the particular occasion or festival. "Dicuntur quin etiam et antiphonæ aptæ diei et loco; similiter et lectiones aptæ diei quæcumque leguntur" (*Peregr. Silvæ* in Duchesne *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, Appendix, p. 483).

† The relation of the "stations" to the Liturgy is well set forth by Fronto Duceus (Le Duc) in a passage quoted by the Bollandist Père Sollier in his dissertation on the cultus of St. Mary Magdalene (*Acta SS. t. v. Julii*, p. 201). On the liturgical activity of St. Damasus cf. Probst *Römischen Sacramentarien* (Munster, 1892), pp. 62 *sqq.* "Vor der Mitte des 4 Jahrhunderts war die Liturgie im Allgemeinen die von Justin beschriebene und in den Apostolischen Constitutionem uns erhaltenen. Von einer Reform derselben vor dem Vierten Jahrhundert lässt sich weder ein spur entdecken, noch ein Grund für eine solche namhaft machen." The zeal of St. Damasus in showing honour to the martyrs is known to us not only from the *Liber Pontificalis* (Ed. Duchesne, pp. 85, 212) but also from the very beautiful inscriptions with which he adorned their tombs, and so many of which have been brought to light by De Rossi. That stations were held at the tombs of the martyrs in his time appears from the words of Ammianus Marcellinus, quoted by Probst: "Populus per cæmeteria martyrum stationes celebrabat." That such celebrations received a great impetus from his activity in searching out these tombs (*L. P. l. c.*) may be regarded as certain.

in this particular, an interesting instance of arrested development. As regards the second class of changes, the evidence, such as it is, will be brought forward later. Now while this process of liturgical development and reconstruction was going forward in Rome, a somewhat similar process, going beyond it in some particulars, but in others falling far short of it, brought the Gallican rite into the shape in which it is known to us from documents which go back as far as, but probably no further than, the fifth century. The Gallican and Spanish Churches, influenced no doubt by the example of Rome, likewise introduced into the Liturgy a number of variable collects, prefaces, antiphons, and other formulæ;* but while on the one hand they carried the variations much further than the Roman Church has done, and introduced them—to an extent never tolerated in Rome—even into the very central portions of the Mass; on the other hand they lingered far behind both in the matter of structural reform and in the development of a liturgical calendar. The final suppression of the Gallican rite was, in this view, the extension to Gaul and Spain of a reform whereof they had hitherto only very partially enjoyed the advantages.

The above is, if I understand him rightly, substantially the opinion of Dr. Probst. The question, however, is one which must be determined, not by the extrinsic authority of names, however eminent, but on its own merits. My contention then is that the view which I have thus briefly sketched, though perhaps not capable of being strictly and completely demonstrated, may at least be shown, from the analogy of history and from the internal evidence of liturgical documents, to be indefinitely more probable than the “Ephesine” hypothesis which seems to have such a charm for a whole school of writers in this country.

Before proceeding to describe the *Ordo* of the Gallican Mass, it will be well to give a very brief description of the original sources of information on the subject which are available.

1. Earliest in point of date is a collection of eleven Masses, most of them unfortunately more or less incomplete, recovered

* Dr. Probst gives good grounds for the opinion that this change was introduced into Gaul in the fifth century, and into Spain in the sixth century (*Ztschr. k. f. T. l. c.*).

in 1850 by F. J. Mone from a palimpsest codex of St. Jerome's Commentary on St. Matthew, which formerly belonged to the monastery of Reichenau (*Augia Dives*).^{*} Of these Masses it must be enough to say that the character of the writing and the theological phraseology employed alike point to a period within the limits of the fifth century, and that they reveal a stage of liturgical development intermediate between the fixed formulæ beyond which the Eastern churches have never advanced, and the collects varying from day to day or from season to season of the ecclesiastical year which are the common characteristic of later Western sacramentaries both Roman and Gallican. The Reichenau Masses were evidently composed at a time when a departure from the fixed prayers of the primitive liturgy was fully recognised as lawful, but on the other hand only one or at most two of them appear to have been destined for use on any particular festival. The rest are of that indeterminate character which marks the *Missa Cottidiana* of the later liturgical books, and are related to one another somewhat as the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom is related to that of St. Basil, or as the various Coptic Liturgies are related among themselves, any one of them being *per se* equally suited to any and every day of the Christian year. One of the Masses is, with the exception of a single prayer, entirely written in hexameter verse (!); and the whole *libellus*, while witnessing to the antiquity of the structure of the Gallican rite, at the same time testifies to the relatively late development, in Gaul, of what may be called a liturgical *system* in harmony with the ecclesiastical calendar, and also to a dangerous tendency to indulge in long-drawn periods and in gratuitous variations of no special significance.

2. Next in chronological order come two letters or brief tractates of St. Germanus of Paris (*d. A.D. 576*) in the first of which the course or *Ordo* of the Liturgy in use in his time is described with some minuteness.[†] With the letters of St.

* *Lateinische u. Griechische Messen*, hsgb. v. Fr. J. Mone (1850); reprinted in Migne *P. L.* cxxxviii. 855 *sqq.*, and in Neale and Forbes, *Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church*, pp. 1 *sqq.* It may be conveniently referred to as the *Missale Augiense*. There is no need to coin a new adjective *Reichenauense* (Denzinger) or *Richenovense* (Neale and Forbes) when *Augiense*, duly formed from *Augia*, has been in possession since the Middle Ages.

† Migne, *P. L.* lxxii. 88 *sqq.*

Germanus may fitly be coupled the treatise *De Officiis* of St. Isidore of Seville. Moreover, a series of liturgical allusions in the works of St. Gregory of Tours, which have been diligently collected by Ruinart,* and various decrees of Gallican and Spanish Councils, may be mentioned as throwing light on the history of the Hispano-Gallican rite.

3. We may group together in the third place four Missals or Sacramentaries dating from the seventh and eighth centuries, and known respectively as the Gothic (*Missale Gothicum*), the Frankish (*M. Francorum*), the Gallican (*M. Gallicanum*), and that of Bobbio (*M. Bobbiense*).† With the exception of the last named, these books contain no Scripture lessons and none of them contain either Antiphons (answering to our *Introit*, &c.) or rubrics. In a word they are technically speaking Sacramentaries rather than Missals.‡ No Gallican Antiphonary is known to exist, but the information conveyed by the Sacramentaries is largely supplemented by two Lectionaries, one of which formerly belonged to the monastery of Luxeuil (*Lectionarium Lucoviense*) and the other to that of Silos in Spain. The latter, which has been published within the last few months by Dom Germain Morin under the title of *Liber Comicus s. Liber Lectionarius . . . quo Toletana Ecclesia . . . utebatur*, is thought by the learned editor to represent the liturgical usage of Toledo in the ninth century.§

4. The Mozarabic Missal (*Missale Mixtum secundum Regulam*

* *P. L.* lxxi. 39 *sqq.*

† The names of the first three rest upon a conjecture of Tommasi, their first editor, as to the region or province to which they respectively belonged. The fourth, called by Mabillon *Sacramentarium Gallicanum Vetus*, may be more conveniently named as above, from St. Columbanus' monastery of Bobbio, to which it formerly belonged. A conjecture that it may perhaps have been brought thither, possibly by St. Columbanus himself, from his earlier foundation of Luxeuil in the diocese of Besançon, hardly justifies Dr. Neale and Bishop Forbes in labelling it with a new title as the *M. Vesontionense*. The *M. Gothicum* contains seventy Masses, the *M. Francorum* only ten, the *M. Gall.*, and *M. Bobbiense* eighteen and sixty-one respectively.

‡ A *Missale plenum*, or *mixtum*—i.e., a Missal in our modern sense of the word—was formed by the fusion of at least three books, the Sacramentary, the Lectionary, and the Antiphonary.

§ The four Gallican Sacramentaries and the Luxeuil Lectionary have been reprinted from the earlier editions of Tommasi and Mabillon in *P. L.* lxxii. The *M. Gothicum*, *M. Gallicanum*, and “*M. Vesontionense*” (*sic*) in Neale and Forbes, *op. cit.*, with very valuable marginal notes giving parallels from the Roman Sacramentaries, the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Missals, &c. The *Liber Comicus* (the adjective is formed from *comes*, the old term for a Lectionary) has recently been published at Maredsous (1893).

B. Isidori, dictum Mozarabes), edited in its present form by Cardinal Ximenes in A.D. 1500, though it contains a great deal which is of relatively recent origin, has faithfully preserved the structure of the Spanish rite as described by St. Isidore; and it is especially valuable by reason of its very full and explicit rubrics, for in the early sacramentaries rubrics are, as has been said, conspicuous by their absence.* Less important, but still by no means to be despised, is the information to be derived, chiefly by way of inference, from the Ambrosian Missal,† from the scanty remains of the early Irish and Scottish Liturgy,‡ and from some of the local usages which survived the Carolingian reforms in certain churches in France.

In our examination of the structure of the Liturgy, it will be convenient to consider separately its two principal parts, the *Missa Catechumenorum* and the *Missa Fidelium*, which take their name from the formulæ of dismissal (*Missa* = *Missio*, dismissal) with which each was originally brought to a close. The division is, as might be supposed from its more archaic character, more strongly marked in the Gallican rite than in the Roman (Gregorian) Mass.

For our knowledge of the course and order of the Gallican *Missa Catechumenorum*, we are chiefly indebted to St. Germanus of Paris, without whose clear exposition the meagre information supplied by the sacramentaries with respect to the part of the Liturgy, would be hardly intelligible.

* It were too long to tell the history of the survival, in a few churches, of the Mozarabic (Spanish) Liturgy. It is now in use only in a single chapel at Toledo. The Mozarabic Missal of Ximenes, with the valuable introduction and notes of Fr. Alexander Leslie, S.J., is given in Migne, *P. L.* lxxxv.

† The earliest printed edition is that of 1475. Liturgical students eagerly await the publication, from a ninth century MS., of a *Missale Ambrosianum Vetus* (edited by Dr. Ceriani of the Ambrosian Library, Milan), of which the Rev. F. E. Brightman, of the Pusey House, Oxford, has most obligingly furnished me with an advance sheet containing the Canon. I take this opportunity of thanking Mr. Brightman for his kindness in reading the MS. of this paper, and for several valuable suggestions, of which want of space alone has prevented me from making as much use as I could have wished.

‡ The *Reliquiae Liturgicae Celticae* has been, on the whole, excellently edited by the Rev. F. E. Warren (*The Liturgy and Ritual of the Early Celtic Church*, Clarendon Press, 1881), to whom my best thanks are due for a series of excellent photographic facsimiles of nine pages of the "Stowe Missal." Of this precious liturgical monument, however, Mr. Warren's edition must yield the palm to the admirable monograph and transcript published by the Rev. Dr. B. Mac Carthy in the "Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy," vol. xxvii. (1886), of which most valuable paper I hope to treat more fully in a subsequent article.

The public service commenced, according to the description of this writer, with the *Antiphona ad prelegendum*.* It was chanted by the choir during the entrance of the celebrant, and accordingly, like the choral pieces, it finds no place in the Sacramentaries. The sacred ministers having arrived in the sanctuary, and silence having been proclaimed by the deacon, the *Aius* ('Αγιος) or *Trisagion* was sung, being followed by the *Kyrie Eleison* intoned by three youthful choristers (*parvuli*).† The Canticle of Zachary (*Benedictus*), technically called the *Prophetia*, was next chanted, and was followed by the *Collectio* (or *Oratio*) *post Prophetiam*, a prayer which—as we learn from the Sacramentaries—echoes and emphasises the closing phrases of the Canticle. Then came the Scripture lessons, three in number, one from the Old Testament, one from the Apostolic Writings (Epistles or Acts), and one from the Gospels. On certain festivals of saints, however, the Acts of their martyrdom were read, either in addition to the three Scripture lessons, or in place of the first of them, and from Easter to Pentecost a lesson from the *Apocalypse* occupied the first place.‡

The *Apostolus*, or Epistle, was followed by the Canticle of the Three Children (*Benedictus es Domine Deus patrum nostrorum*, &c., or *Benedicite*, &c.), and this by a prayer, the *Collectio post Benedictionem* (*sic*), alluding, like the *Collectio post Prophetiam*, to the subject-matter of the Canticle.

The Gospel was preceded by the *Responsorium* and followed

* I say the *public* service so commenced, for there is reason to suppose that at least in the earliest times there was a short preliminary rite, not of a public nature, in which the elements for the holy sacrifice were prepared (*Cf.* Duchesne, *Origines du Culte*, p. 195). Such a preparatory service, preceding the *Introit*, and precisely answering to the *Prothesis* of the Greek and Eastern Liturgies, is described in the liturgical tract appended to the Stowe Missal, and in the later recension of the same tract contained in the "Lebar Brecc." The text and translation of both are given by MacCarthy, *l. c.* pp. 245 *sqq.*, and (less correctly) by Dr. Whitley Stokes in the *Ztschr. f. Vergl. Sprachforschung*, 1882, pp. 441 *sqq.*, for a loan of whose paper I am indebted to Dr. MacCarthy. On the preliminary "Preparation and Oblation of the Gifts" in the various early Liturgies eastern and western, there is a very able essay by Dr. Wickham Legg in the *Trans. of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, 1892, pp. 49 *sqq.*, for a copy of which I have to thank the Rev. E. S. Dewick, F.S.A.

† So in the Ambrosian rite: "Tunc Magister scholæ dicit ter *Kyrie* cum pueris suis" (Beroldus in *Muratori Antiqu. Ital.*, iv. 869).

‡ A single example of a lesson from the *Acta Martyrum* is given in the Luxeuil Lectionary on the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul, and another, on the Feast of St. Stephen, in the *Liber Comicus* of Toledo. The latter is a history of miracles wrought at the Saint's intercession, and is either wholly or in part taken from the *De Civitate Dei* of St. Augustine.

by the *Prex* (sic) or *preces*, a series of supplications for mercy analogous to the *Ectene* of the Greek Liturgies. At its conclusion came the proclamation, which already in St. Germanus's time had become a mere formality, that the Catechumens should withdraw, and with this dismissal of the Catechumens the first part of the service (*Missa Catechumenorum*) came to an end.

Such is the description given by St. Germanus of the course or *Ordo* of the first portion of the Gallican Liturgy. Concerning this description, however, two points must be noted. In the first place as regards the succession of the several parts there can be little doubt that some allowance must be made for variety of local usage. Thus St. Germanus places the *Preces* after the Gospel, and this is the position which they occupy in the Mozarabic rite on all the Sundays in Lent except the first. But in the Ambrosian Mass, and on the first Sunday in Lent in the Mozarabic Liturgy also, we find them occurring immediately after the *Ingressu* or *Officium ad Missam*, while in the Stowe Missal the *Deprecatio Sancti Martini** intervenes between the Epistle and the Gospel. Again, whereas in the Gallican Mass as described by St. Germanus the *Responsorium*, like the Roman *Gradual* and Ambrosian *Psalmulus*, follows the Epistle, the Mozarabic rite places it immediately after the lesson from the Old Testament.

Secondly, it is by no means certain that all the prayers, chants, and formulae which St. Germanus mentions were in daily use. Indeed the evidence which we have from other sources points to the conclusion that several of them were employed on particular occasions only; a circumstance which must be borne in mind in the comparison which we are now to institute between the Gallican and the Roman *Missa Catechumenorum*.† Such a comparison ought, I venture to think, to leave no doubt in the mind of any student who will investigate the matter for himself, as to the far closer affinity of the Gallican *Ordo* with the Roman Liturgy than with any Eastern rite.

On the correspondence between the Gallican *Antiphona ad prælegendum*, the Mozarabic *Officium ad Missam*, the Ambrosian

* The oldest and fullest extant example of a Gallican *Prex*.

† Dr. Swainson (*Dict. Christian Antiquities*, art. "Liturgies") conjectures that Germanus is describing the Mass on Christmas Day.

Ingressa and the Roman *Introit* it is hardly necessary to insist. They are merely different names for what were in substance the same thing. The deacon's proclamation of silence has indeed long since fallen into disuse in the Roman rite, but we find it in the Gelasian sacramentary ; and the *Aius* or *Trisagion* still survives in the morning office of Good Friday. That, like the *Kyrie Eleison*, it is an importation from the Greek Church is obvious, but as no trace of it occurs in the Clementine Liturgy it seems probable that it was of comparatively late origin. Moreover, the importation of particular items proves nothing as to the origin of the Liturgy as a whole. The singing of the *Kyrie* by children finds its analogy in the quaint Ambrosian ritual drawn up by Beroldus : " *Tunc magister scholæ dicit ter Kyrie cum pueris suis* ; " while the word *schola*, here used of the choir, at once suggests a Roman parallel or original. Next comes the *Prophetia* or canticle of Zachary. Of the use of this canticle, it must be admitted, neither the Roman nor the Ambrosian, nor we may add the Mozarabic Liturgy, has preserved any trace. There are, however, clear indications that it formed no part of the Gallican rite in its earliest form, and that its use was always confined to certain festivals or seasons. I argue in the first place from the name of the *Antiphona ad prælegendum*, which clearly implies that originally the lessons followed immediately or almost immediately upon the entrance of the sacred ministers. And a second argument may be based on the infrequency with which traces of the canticle occur in the Gallican sacramentaries. The Reichenau and Frankish Missals each contain only two instances of an *Oratio post Prophetiam*, but as the total number of masses in these missals does not exceed twenty-one, it would not be wise to build too much upon this. But when we find moreover that the *Missale Gothicum* with its seventy Masses also contains only two examples of such a prayer—viz., on Christmas Day and on Easter Sunday—and that in both cases the prayer is specially appropriate to the feast, there seems to be no room for doubt that in the church to which this Missal belonged the *Benedictus* was not in daily use. The Bobbio Missal contains five instances of the *Collectio post Prophetiam*, one for Advent, one for the Mass of St. John Baptist, where the canticle of the Baptist's father was specially appropriate, and the other three for Sunday Masses.

It has been said that we have no evidence for the Roman use of the *Benedictus*, but when it is noticed that this canticle with its accompanying collect occupies in the Gallican rite precisely the same position which the *Gloria in excelsis* and the principal collect hold in the Roman Mass, and when moreover it is remembered how gradual was the introduction of the *Gloria* into the daily liturgical usage of Rome, we may safely infer either that the *Gloria* has ousted the *Benedictus* in the Roman, the Ambrosian, and the Mozarabic Liturgy, or else that the use of the canticle of Zachary was a local peculiarity. Which-ever of the two alternatives be accepted as the more probable, the case of the Roman and of the Mozarabic Missal is on the same footing. There is no proof that the *Benedictus* ever formed a portion of the Spanish Liturgy. All that we can say is, that if it did, then it has been displaced by the *Gloria in excelsis*. In the Bobbio Missal we find the *Gloria* and the *Benedictus* side by side, both as it would seem for occasional, and probably for alternative, use. At any rate since the *Benedictus* finds no place in any Greek or Eastern Liturgy, its Gallican use could hardly be seriously used as an argument in favour of the Ephesine hypothesis.

The three lessons from Holy Scripture are still preserved in the Ambrosian rite, while in the Roman Missal they have survived only on the Wednesdays in the Ember weeks. But the present combination of the Gradual with the Tract or with the Alleluia and its versicle supplies—as M. Duchesne was the first to point out—an unmistakable indication that a threefold lesson was formerly the rule and not the exception.* When three lessons are said, the first is followed by the Gradual and the second by the Tract, or *vice versa*, and there can be little doubt that the omission of the first lesson brought Gradual and Tract (or Alleluia) into their present juxtaposition.

The Canticle of the Three Children is still recited in the Roman Mass five times in each year—viz., on Holy Saturday and on the Saturdays in our Ember weeks, and it is followed by the well-known prayer, “Deus qui tribus pueris mitigasti flamas ignium,” which in the Gelasian Sacramentary bears the title of (*Oratio*) *post Benedictionem*. The Fourth

* *Origines*, p. 160.

Council of Toledo, held in A.D. 633, ordered the recital of this canticle on all Sundays and festivals of martyrs,* but it is remarkable that the Toledo Lectionary assigns it to Holy Saturday only, the Lectionary of Luxeuil to Holy Saturday and Christmas Day, while the Bobbio Missal contains only a single example of a collect to be recited after the canticle, and this collect is the *Roman* prayer “Deus qui tribus pueris,” with the partly *Roman* title *Collectio post Benedictionem*.† It should be mentioned, however, that the two Lectionaries, like the *Roman* Missal, place the *Canticum Trium Puerorum*, not after the *Apostolus*, but immediately after that Lesson from the Prophet Daniel with which it is naturally linked (Dan. iii. 1-51). This usage may, then, be unconnected with the ordinary chanting of the same canticle between the *Apostolus* and the Gospel to which St. Germanus and the Council of Toledo testify. I suspect, however, that the use of the *Benedicite* (or *Benedictus* of Daniel) on particular days led to its more frequent use, precisely as was the case with the *Gloria in excelsis*—originally recited only on Christmas Day—in the *Roman* Liturgy. This is a point on which it may be hoped that fresh light will be thrown by Dr. Probst, or by the learned Benedictines who in our days as of old are doing so much for the elucidation of early liturgical documents.‡

There remain then only the *preces* to be accounted for, and he would be a bold man who would deny, in face of their survival in the Ambrosian Missal, that the *Roman* Liturgy once had its *preces* no less than the Gallican.§ Nor is more direct evidence wanting.

* Conc. Tol. IV. cap. xiv. in Hardouin *Concilia*, iii. 584.

† Mr. Brightman, however, here warns me that I have not made sufficient allowance for the presence of distinctively Gallican elements in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, and a pamphlet by Dom S. Büumer (“Ueber das sogenannte Sacr. Gelasianum”), which only reached me after these pages were in print, enforces the same warning.

‡ Walafrid Strabo, after mentioning the Toledo decree, says: “Quod Romani propter multiplicatatem officiorum non faciunt nisi quater per annum, diebus quibus duodecim lectionum numerus adimpletur” (P. L., cxiv. 947).

§ It is impossible here to discuss M. Duchesne’s theory that the Gallican Liturgy originated neither in Rome nor at Ephesus but at Milan. I can only say that the hypothesis is devoid of proof, and that the antecedent probabilities are all in favour of Rome. No one, of course, could reasonably deny that the liturgical uses of the various churches mutually influenced one another in various ways, and to an extent which it is impossible to trace at this distance of time.

A well-known letter of St. Gregory the Great to John, Bishop of Syracuse, clearly implies that the *Kyrie Eleison* is merely the survival of a longer *deprecatio*.* And the Gelasian Sacramentary prescribes the *Kyrie Eleison cum Laetania* on the Saturdays of the *Quatuor tempora*.† The *Deprecatio Sti. Martini* in the Stowe Missal is indeed more nearly similar in form to the *Etenē* of the Greek rites than to any extant Roman formula; but, as Dr. MacCarthy has pointed out, its analogies with the Clementine Liturgy are closer than with the Byzantine forms. And inasmuch as there is the strongest probability that the Clementine Liturgy represents that primitive rite which in the first three centuries was common to Rome with the rest of Christendom, it follows that neither the general use of *preces* in the Gallican rite, nor the *Deprecatio S. Martini* in particular, bespeaks a specially Ephesine origin. It is clear from the words of St. Gregory that in what concerns the form of the *preces* used in the Roman rite, the fullest discretion had been employed in making such alterations or modifications as had seemed fitting to him and his predecessors. Nor can any argument in favour of the Ephesine hypothesis be based on the circumstance that the Gallican *Ordo* contained the *Kyrie* in addition to the *preces*, for, strange as it may seem, there can be little doubt that the *Kyrie* as such was borrowed from Rome. This assertion is based on a remarkable passage in the *Peregrinatio Silviae*,‡ which incidentally bears witness to the fact that the form *Kyrie Eleison* was not in use in Gaul in the fourth century, but its Latin equivalent *Domine miserere*, precisely as in the *Deprecatio S. Martini*.

It would seem then that the Gallican rite had on the one hand preserved the *preces* in their older Latin form, while on the other it had borrowed from Rome that shorter formula which in the Roman Mass had been substituted for the older

* "In quotidianis autem missis aliqua *qua divi solent tacemus, tantummodo Kyrie Eleison et Christe Eleison dicimus, ut in his deprecationis vocibus paulo diutius occupemur." The reader will remember that in the Morning Office of Holy Saturday, according to the Roman rite, the final *Kyrie Eleison* and *Christe Eleison* of the Litany is the *Kyrie* of the Mass. It would not be safe to lay too much stress on the presence of *preces* in the strangely conglomerate *Ordo Missae* (probably of the seventh century, and Roman rather than Gallican in structure) discovered by Flacius Illyricus in 1557 (*Martene de Ecclesiasticis Ritibus*, i. 176 *sqq.* Ed. Bassano, 1788).*

† Migne, *P. L.*, lxxiv. 1069.

‡ Duchesne, Appendix, p. 472.

preces, as well as the more fully developed litany which on special occasions was added to the *Kyrie*.

So much then for the *Missa Catechumenorum*. The *Missa Fidelium*, it must be admitted, presents at first sight somewhat greater difficulties. Its structure may be most conveniently exhibited in tabular form, the corresponding items in the Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies being indicated in parallel columns. In a third column I give St. Isidore's brief description of the seven prayers which he selects as fundamental. I omit from the table the choral portions of the service, answering to the Roman Offertory and Communion Antiphons. These present no special difficulty, and may be regarded rather as accompaniments than as integral portions of the Liturgy. The items to which a number is prefixed are *per se* variable, though in the great majority of Gallican Masses only the first five are "proper" to the day, the remainder having to be supplied from elsewhere, just as in the Roman Missal many festivals have only a single "proper" prayer, others three (Collect, Secret, and Post-communion), while some have proper lessons as well, while very few have a proper preface or special clauses in the Canon (*Communicantes* and *Hanc igitur*).

GALLICAN.	MOZARABIC.	ST. ISIDORE.*
1. PRÆFATIO MISSÆ†	MISSA . . .	Prima oratio admonitionis est erga populum ut excitemur ad exorandum Deum.
2. COLLECTIO SEQUENS‡	ALIA ORATIO . . .	Secunda invocationis ad Deum est ut clementer suscipiat preces fidelium, &c.
<i>Recitatio nominum</i> . . .	<i>Rec. nominum</i> . . .	
3. C. POST NOMINA §	POST NOMINA ORATIO . . .	Tertia effunditur pro offerentibus sive pro defunctis fidelibus, &c.
4. C. AD PACEM§	AD PACEM ORATIO . . .	Quarta post hæc inferatur pro osculo pacis, ut charitate reconciliati, &c.

* *De officiis*, i. 15.

† *Præfatio Missæ*. Not to be confounded with the Roman *Præfatio*, which answers to the Gallican *Contestatio* (No. 5). This prayer often has no title. It is sometimes called *Collectio*, or (apparently) *Missa*, especially in the Bobbio Missal.

‡ *C. sequens*. The title is commonly written *Coll. sequitur*, often simply *Collectio*. (The form *sequens* does not occur.) In the Mozarabic title *Alia = Altera*.

§ The word *Collectio* only occasionally occurs in these titles.

5. IMMOLATIO MISSÆ S. CONTESTATIO* . .	ILLATIO . . .	Quinta deinde infertur illatio in sanctifica- tione oblationis . . . et Osanna in excelsis cantatur, &c.
SANCTUS . . .	SANCTUS	
6. POST SANCTUS . . .	POST SANCTUS	
PRIDIÆ (Canon)† . .	(Canon)	
7. POST SECRETA S.‡ POST MYSTERIUM . .	POST PRIDIÆ . .	Sexta ex hinc succedit conformatio Sacra- menti, ut oblatio . . . sanctificata per Spir- itum S. Christi cor- pori et sanguini con- formetur.
8. ANTE ORAT. DOMINICAM AD ORAT. DOMINICAM ORATIO DOMINICA . .	ORATIO DOMINICA . .	Ultima est oratio qua Dominus noster dis- cipulos nostros orare instituit, dicens <i>Pater Noster</i> , &c.
9. POST ORAT. DOMINICAM (Non variatur)		
10. BENEDICTIO POPULI . .	BENEDICTIO POPULI	
11. POST EUCHARISTIAM . (Deest)		
12. CONSUMMATIO MISSÆ . ORATIO		

Now it is obvious at a glance that the liturgical framework here exhibited differs considerably from that of the Roman Mass. A little examination, however, will show that the dissimilarity is by no means so fundamental as it might at first sight appear to be.

It will be noticed that with the exception of the *Benedictio Populi*, which stands alone, and which was confined, I believe, to Pontifical functions, the prayers specified in the above scheme have been bracketed together in groups, and for the most part in pairs. This arrangement, or rather the facts which underlie and justify it, have not, I believe, received sufficient attention from those who have written concerning the Gallican Liturgy. Taking first the groups numbered (1-2), (3-4) and (11-12), a careful examination of the Gallican Masses in the five Sacramentaries reveals the fact—not hitherto noticed—that the first member of each group, that is to say the *Præfatio*, the

* *Immolatio s. Contestatio*. Precisely similar in form to the Roman *Preface*, but much more diffuse and circumstantial.

† *Pridie*. Not called “Canon” in Gallican books, but merely indicated by the words *Qui pridie* or *Ipse enim pridie*. The Mozarabic Canon no longer begins with these words. But the name of the following prayer (*Post Pridie*) shows that the older Canon did so commence.

‡ *Post Secreta*, i.e., after the Canon, which (as the phrase implies) was said secretly, whereas the *Post Sanctus* was said aloud or (as in the Mozarabic rite) chanted.

Post Nomina, and the *Post Eucharistiam*, was originally a hortatory address to the people, a “ bidding prayer,” or invitation to pray, and that the collect which immediately follows is the prayer which answers to the invitation. This is indicated by the word *sequitur*, which in so large a number of instances qualifies the first and principal collect (*i.e.*, *præmissa prefatione sequitur collectio*), and which, in a few cases, is used also of the *Collectio ad Pacem* and of the *Consummatio Missæ*.* In like manner the name *Prefatio* is in one case used to designate what is commonly called the (*Collectio*) *post Eucharistium*. A single instance from each of the three groups will be sufficient to illustrate the subject.

Pref. Missæ.†—Christo Domino nostro qui pro nobis dignatus est carne nasci, lege circumcidisti, flumine baptizari, fratres carissimi humiliter deprecemur, ut intra Ecclesiæ uterum nos viventes quotidie recreatione parturiat

Collectio.—Sancte omnipotens æterne Deus tu nos convertens vivifica: et quos error gentilitatis involvit agnitionis tuae munus absolvat

C. post Nomina.‡—Auditis nominibus offerentum fratres dilectissimi Christum Dominum deprecemur; ut sicut pro ejus circumcisione carnali sollemnia celebramus, ita spiritualium nequitiarum inlusione devicta laetemur

C. ad Pacem.—Deus qui magis circumcisionem cordis quam corporis diligis tu nostras aures deseca ne audiant sanguinem, corda ne teneant dolum, oculos ne invadant alienum. . . .

Post Eucharistiam.§—Cibo coelesti saginati, et poculo æterni calicis recreati fratres carissimi Domino Deo nostro laudes et gratias indesinenter agamus, petentes ut qui sacrosanctum corpus

Consummatio Missæ.||—Sit nobis Domine quæsumus medicina mentis et corporis ¶

* *E.g.*, the *Coll. ad Pacem* is inscribed *Coll. sequitur* in the last Mass in the *M. Gallicanum* (Neale and Forbes, p. 204), and the *Consummatio Missæ* is similarly entitled in the Christmas Mass of the *M. Gothicum* (*ibid.* p. 37).

† From the Mass for the Circumcision in the *M. Gothicum* (Neale and Forbes, pp. 45 *sqq.*). The title *Pref. Missæ* is wanting in the MS., as often elsewhere.

‡ From the same Mass.

§ From the Mass for Christmas Day in the same Missal (Neale and Forbes, p. 37). The title of the prayer here is *Post Communionem* in the MS., but more commonly *Post Eucharistiam*.

|| Here inscribed *Collectio sequitur*. I give the more usual title.

¶ A Roman prayer, found in the Gelasian Sacramentary (Neale and Forbes, *ibid. marg.*).

I have said that this was the original arrangement, a statement which I think no one will be inclined to question who will take the trouble to go through the Gallican Sacramentaries for himself. But the truth has been obscured by the circumstance that in a very large number of the Gallican Masses even the first bidding prayer, the *Præfatio Missæ*, has lost its original character and has become a mere collect side by side with the *Collectio sequens*.* And as regards the *Post Nomina*, and still more as regards the *Post Eucharistium*, the retention of the earlier form is the exception rather than the rule, so that in the large majority of cases the group composed of a hortatory address with its accompanying prayer has become simply a pair of collects having no separate and distinct *raison d'être*.†

A few figures may help to set the facts of the case in a clearer light. In the *Missale Gothicum*, if I may trust my own counting, the first prayer has retained its character as a true *Præfatio* in twenty-four cases out of sixty-nine which admit of comparison; the *Post Nomina* in twenty out of sixty-nine; the *Post Eucharistium* in eight cases out of fifteen.‡ The Bobbio Missal has twenty true *Præfationes* in fifty-seven Masses; the *Missale Gallicanum* only three in sixteen; the *Missale Francorum* not one. In the Reichenau Missal on the other hand, which is, it will be remembered, by far the oldest of the Gallican Mass-books, the *Præfatio*, the *Post Nomina*, and the *Post Eucharistium* have retained, with only one or two exceptions, their original character as hortatory addresses.§ It

* There is this inconvenience about the title *Collectio sequens* which I have adopted, that it might seem to imply a previous *collect*. I must therefore remind the reader that in the MS. the title, when fully given, is *Collectio sequitur (i.e., sequitur præfationem)*, which implies not a previous collect but an introductory bidding prayer.

† Thus, in the first Advent Mass of the *Missale Gallicanum*, instead of a *præfatio* and *collectio sequens*, we have simply side by side the Roman collects now used on the first and second Sundays of Advent, "Excita potentiam" and "Excita corda nostra" (Neale and Forbes, p. 155; cf. p. 213).

‡ Only fifteen of the seventy-one Masses in the *M. Gothicum* have a *P. Euch.* at all.

§ The Masses in this Sacramentary being few and fragmentary, the total number of bidding prayers amounts to no more than twelve—viz., four *Præfationes*, six *Collectiones post Nomina*, and two *Post Eucharistium*. I may add that in the Bobbio Missal, by a strange perversity, the *Collectio sequens* and the *Collectio ad Pacem* have in one or two cases the hortatory form—e.g., "Tempus hoc sacratissimum fl. dd. . . . celebremus" (Neale and Forbes, p. 241. See also a *Coll. ad Pacem*, *ibid.* p. 228).

should be mentioned however that in St. Isidore's brief description of the Mass, while the *Præfatio* is still a true bidding prayer, the *Post Nomina* appears to have already, in the Spanish rite, lost that character.

Now, if for the three Gallican bidding prayers we substitute the simpler Roman and Ambrosian invitation, expressed by the single word *Oremus* (or in the case of the *Secreta* by the *Orate fratres*, &c.), we have an arrangement which answers in every particular to the Ambrosian, and in every particular but one to the Roman *Ordo Missæ*; the *Collectio sequens* (Gallican) or *Alia Oratio* (Mozarabic) answering to the Ambrosian *Oratio super Sindonem*, the *Collectio ad Pacem* answering to the Ambrosian *Oratio super Oblata* and to the Roman *Secreta*, and the *Consummatio Missæ* answering to the Roman and Ambrosian Post-Communion, or more strictly, perhaps, to the *Oratio super populum* of the Lenten Masses in the Roman Missal. That the Roman Mass originally possessed a prayer answering to the Ambrosian *Oratio super Sindonem* no one, I believe, seriously doubts; it has indeed left a trace of its former existence in the *Oremus* (followed by no corresponding collect) which the celebrant says immediately after the Gospel or Creed. Nor can there be any question as to the correspondence of the Roman *Secreta* with the Gallican *Collectio ad Pacem*, especially when we remember that in the Sacramentaries, Roman and Gallican, both prayers occasionally bear the title *Oratio super Oblata*,* by which the corresponding collect is invariably designated in the Ambrosian Missal.

For the sake of clearness, these simple results may be exhibited in tabular form:—

GALLICAN.	ROMAN.	AMBROSIAN.
{ <i>Præfatio</i> (Bidding Prayer) =	<i>Oremus</i>	= <i>Oremus</i> (?) †
{ <i>Collectio sequens</i>	(Wanting)	= <i>Oratio super Sindonem</i>
{ <i>C. Post Nomina</i> (B.P.) =	<i>Orate Fratres</i>	= <i>Oremus</i> (?) †
{ <i>C. ad Pacem vel Super</i> =	{ <i>Secreta vel Super</i> }	= <i>Oratio super oblata</i>
{ <i>Oblata</i>	{ <i>Oblata</i> }	
{ <i>C. Post Eucharistiam</i> (B.P.) =	<i>Oremus</i>	= <i>Oremus</i> (?) †
{ <i>Consummatio Missæ</i>	= <i>Post Communionem</i>	= <i>Post Communionem</i>

* E.g., in the Gelasian Sacramentary, Migne *P. L.* lxxiv. 1207, and in the *M. Francorum, passim*. Compare the *Coll. ad Pacem* in the 37th *Ordo* of the *M. Gallicanum*, “Respic domine propitius ad munera,” &c., a prayer which, like many other *Coll. ad Pacem*, is verbally identical with a Roman *Secreta* (Neale and Forbes, p. 202).

† It is not clear from the entries of the Ambrosian Missal whether *Oremus* is said before these prayers. But it is certainly said before the *Pater Noster*, and so may rightly be regarded as an Ambrosian no less than a Roman form

I have spoken of the old *Oratio super Sindonem*, the Gallican *Collectio sequens* or *ante Nomina*, as being dropped out of the Roman Liturgy. It would, however, be more correct to say that it has been transferred to the present position of the principal collect—viz., after the *Gloria*. For this transference there was a good and sufficient reason. When the dismissal of the catechumens had fallen into desuetude there was no longer any ground for regarding the portion of the service which follows the Gospel as the commencement of the Mass, since all alike were now present throughout. It was natural then to place the principal collect at what was now the commencement of the service for all alike. A curious and instructive instance of this transfer having actually taken place is found in the *Missa Ecclesiae Romanae* of the Stowe Missal when compared with the *Cottidiana Romensis* in the *M. Bobbiense*. The Bobbio Mass embodies the Roman Canon in a thoroughly Gallican framework, with its full complement of collects in their Gallican position. Now every one of these prayers is found also in the first Mass of the Stowe Missal, but with this difference—that the two first collects (*i.e.*, one which in the Gallican *Ordo* ought to be a *prafatio* or bidding prayer, and the *Collectio sequens*) appear in the Stowe Mass *in the Roman position, before the Scripture lessons*.*

But are we justified, it may not unreasonably be asked, in assuming that the Roman *Oremus* is the truncated survival of an ancient bidding prayer? And it may with confidence be answered that we are. Even had we nothing else to go upon than the evidence supplied by the Clementine Liturgy, we should be led to the conclusion that the earliest type of public liturgical prayers embraced three elements—viz.:

Bidding prayer pronounced by the deacon.

Silent prayer of the worshippers.

Collect pronounced by the priest.†

of invitation. Its retention or omission before a particular prayer is a matter of detail, and its omission would merely be an instance in which the original formula has left a more decided trace of its former existence in the Roman than in the Ambrosian Liturgy.

* The identity of these two Masses has been brought into prominence by Dom Suitbert Bäumer in his admirable paper “Das Stowe-Missale,” in the *Zschr. f. k. T.*, July 1892 (*cf.* MacCarthy, *l. c.* pp. 196 *sqq.*, Neale and Forbes, pp. 206 *sqq.*). I cannot enter here into a discussion of a slight difference of arrangement as between the *prima* and the *secunda missa* of the Stowe book (pp. 196, 7). It in no way affects the main argument.

† This “triformity” (the word is Mr. Hammond’s) is or should be obvious

But there is no lack of evidence nearer home than this. Even down to the present day the Roman Liturgy has not entirely abandoned her bidding prayer, of which one example may be found in the petitions which follow the Litany of the Saints, while a still more perfect series of such prayers has survived in the morning office of Good Friday, so familiar to us all. In the latter case, it may be observed the words *Flectamus genua, Levate*, still preserve the memory of the interval which was formerly spent in silent prayer, and which is still prescribed in connection with the collects in the Gelasian Sacramentary.* But these are not the only instances of Roman bidding prayers. The Gelasian Sacramentary contains at least a dozen examples of such prayers, several of which are called by the very name *Prafatio*, which we have found in the Gallican books; while one of them is evidently intended to be prefixed to the principal collect of the day, just as the Gallican *Prafatio* is prefixed to the *Collectio sequens*.† As regards the first bidding prayer there is then no doubt that it represents an early Roman no less than a Gallican usage; though it may freely be admitted as at least possible that in the Roman ritual this prefatory prayer was less frequently employed and (like other portions of the Liturgy) less subject to daily variations than the Gallican *Prafatio*. As regards the formula which introduced the *Collectio ad Pacem* or *super Oblata* the case is yet more clear, for it has survived in the *Orate fratres*, a true bidding prayer, which is daily recited in the Roman Mass. Nor are indications wanting that the Roman Post-communion was also in early times introduced by a bidding prayer. Any one who will turn over the pages of the Leonine Sacramentary can hardly fail to be struck by the frequency

to any one who has carefully studied the Clementine Liturgy (*Const. Ap.*, lib. viii.) ; but I owe to Mr. Hammond the suggestion to appeal to it in illustration of the present matter. The arrangement in the text I take verbatim from a very kind and encouraging letter which I have received from him in connection with this paper."

* *P. L.* lxxiv. 1103, "Adnuntiat diaconus *Flectamus genua*, et post paululum dicit *Levate*."

† *Ibid.*, 1070, 1071, 1084, 1091, 1107, 1133, 1144 (*Prefationes*), 1155 (*Denunciations*). The *Denunciatio natalitii unius martyris* is in this form: "Noverit vestra devotio sanctissimi fratres quod b. M. *illius* anniversarius dies intrat Ideo dominum conlaudemus qui est mirabilis in sanctis suis," &c. On p. 1244 there is a bidding prayer of precisely the same character with certain Celtic liturgical formulæ, which Mr. Warren ("Celtic Liturgy," p. 167) calls "a distinct mark of Ephesine (!) origin."

with which *two* post-communion collects are given; and a closer scrutiny will suggest the conclusion that, in many cases at least, the first member of each pair bears in its construction the marks of having been changed from a bidding prayer into the actual form in which it appears in the sacramentary. A few instances must be sufficient to indicate the direction in which further research may be expected to yield fuller and more satisfactory results. Take, for instance, the opening clauses of the following couples of Leonine and Post-communion collects.

{ 1. <i>A</i> eternae pignus vitæ capientes humiliter imploramus	
{ 2. <i>T</i> uere Domine plebem tuam et beatorum apostolorum defende	
subsidiis *	
{ 1. <i>S</i> umentes dona cœlestia gratias tibi referimus	
{ 2. <i>P</i> rotege Domine fideles tuos +	
{ 1. <i>R</i> epleti benedictione cœlesti suppliciter imploramus	
{ 2. <i>Protector in te operantium Deus respice populum suppli-</i>	
cantem ‡	
{ 1. <i>Solemnitatis apostolicae multiplicatione gaudentes depre-</i>	
camur	
{ 2. <i>Presta quæsumus Domine Deus noster §</i>	

Now it will be noticed that in each of these instances the first prayer, instead of beginning with an invocation and petition, as the second invariably does, commences instead with the recital of the motive of the prayer followed by *imploramus*, *deprecamur*, *gratias agimus*, or the like. Now we have only to substitute for *imploramus*, *deprecamur*, and *agimus*, the subjunctive forms *imploremus*, *depreremus*, and *agamus*, and we have in each case a perfect Post-communion bidding prayer of the Gallican type. Take again the following parallels:—

Gallican.

¶. *post Eucharistium*.—*Sumsimus ex sacris altaribus Christi Domini ac Dei nostri corpus et sanguinem*; credentes unitatem beatæ Trinitatis oremus. &c.

Roman.

Pc. *Sumpsimus Domine sacerdora mysteri*
Sumpsimus Domine celebritatis annuæ votiva sacramenta
Sumpsimus Domine pignus salutis æternae]

* Migne *P. L.*, lv. 55. + *Ibid.* p. 75. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 57. § *Ibid.* p. 60.

¶ In Mr. H. A. Wilson's valuable "Index to Roman Sacramentaries" (Cambridge, 1892) numerous examples may be found of Post-communion collects in which a very minimum of change would restore them to their original hortatory form. In addition to those commencing as above—*Sumpsimus*, &c.—compare the Post-communions which begin with the words, *Recreati*, *Refici*, *Repleti*, *Satiati*, &c.

If to these instances we add the tell-tale circumstance that in at least one Gelasian post-communion the hortative form *Oremus* occurring in the body of the prayer has escaped the change into the indicative *Oramus*, it will be I think impossible to doubt that many of the Roman post-communion collects owe their origin to the bidding prayers which once followed the communion and introduced the *consummatio missæ*, just as similar prayers are employed in the Gelasian sacramentary in the *consummatio episcopi, sacerdotis, diaconi*.* The disuse of these hortatory formulae is of a piece with the elimination of the *preces* and of other proclamations which anciently belonged to the deacon; and the wisdom which dictated their abandonment should be obvious to any one who will consider how unsuitable such formulae are to private celebrations of the sacred mysteries, and how natural it was that, in the process of shortening the Liturgy to meet the daily needs of the faithful, these formulae should be among the first to fall out or to be modified in character.

In my next paper I hope to discuss those portions of the Gallican Liturgy which correspond to the Roman Canon; and to give some account of the suppression or supersession of the Gallican and Mozarabic rites in France and Spain respectively.

HERBERT LUCAS, S.J.

* *P. L.* lxxiv. 1071 (*consummatio episcopi*, &c.).

ART. VI.—EVOLUTION AND ETHICS.

A FEW weeks ago, Professor Huxley lectured in the Sheldonian Theatre at Oxford before a large and distinguished audience. His subject was in itself sufficiently attractive, even independently of the great reputation of the lecturer, and the title "Evolution and Ethics" was decidedly a "catching" title. Who would not wish to hear such a master upon such a subject? Was he going to expound the obscure laws that govern the "Evolution of Ethics," or, to put the same matter in another way, was he going to lecture upon "the Ethics of Evolution?" Well, the great lecture has been delivered, and is now in print, revised and accompanied by notes and comments. It is, taken all in all, a most interesting document. There are, of course, some signs about it that the great biologist is not quite so well at home in such a subject as in those scientific studies which have occupied so many years of his busy life. The qualities of the specialist are not generally apparent here, and the whole lecture is perhaps more remarkable for its brilliancy than for its depth. Yet the one dominant quality of Professor Huxley's mind, clearless, shines as brightly as ever in this lecture, and if his information appears somewhat scanty and fragmentary, at least there is no possibility of mistaking his meaning, no slight praise when bestowed upon a philosophical composition.

Judging, however, from the various reviews and criticisms which have already appeared, it would seem as if Professor Huxley, in his evident anxiety to be moderate and fair, and to say nothing that might appear out of place in so venerable a place as the Sheldonian Theatre, had somewhat disappointed the expectations of his admiring friends and the apprehensions of his philosophical antagonists. The lecture has received what is called on the other side of the Channel, "A succès d'estime," and so far it does not appear destined to arouse any serious spirit of controversy. One plain but sufficient reason for the peaceful result of this campaign lies perhaps in the fact that the "Romanes Lecture" for 1893 is chiefly a

short historical essay, followed, by way of conclusion, by remarks well calculated to increase the difficulty of the riddle described and analysed in the preceding pages, but utterly useless as a contribution towards its solution ; the whole ending with a piece of excellent advice, such as we are accustomed to read in the daily newspapers, in their reports of speeches addressed to the young men belonging to mutual improvement societies, athletic clubs, &c., by the distinguished persons who are periodically invited to preside over the annual meetings of those interesting bodies. Yet, in spite of the unexciting character of the lecture, it would be a mistake, we venture to say, to consider it as undeserving of attention by thoughtful persons, above all, by those who are privileged to possess a true Christian standard by which to judge of such a production. The careful perusal of it will strengthen their confidence in the solidity of their own position ; but it will more especially supply them with precious weapons in their discussions with non-Christian antagonists ; it will show them which points ought to be urged ; which arguments should be more particularly attacked ; and how weak is the defence likely to be met with when the attack is boldly carried into the enemy's ranks.

As might have been expected, Professor Huxley assumes throughout the truth of the doctrine of evolution as the all but demonstrated solution of the great biological problems raised by the study of Nature. Whether we take the views of Darwin, or those of Wallace ; whether we accept the new theory of Professor Weismann, or whether we side against him with Mr. Herbert Spencer, Evolution remains the foundation upon which Professor Huxley means to build his ethical superstructure, and when he speaks of those who attempt to explain the origin of moral sentiments and of all other natural phenomena, by a process of evolution, the Professor tells us plainly : "I have little doubt, for my own part, that they are on the right track." We shall not enter upon any discussion on this point, as we wish to reserve the limited space at our disposal for other considerations. Cosmic evolution, of some kind or other, might become an established fact, from the most elementary nebula to man, and yet all the difficulties raised by man's intellectual and moral constitution would

still remain unsolved, as the Professor candidly admits in the following passage (p. 31):

Cosmic evolution may teach us how the good and evil tendencies of man may have come about; but, in itself, it is incompetent to furnish any better reason why what we call good is preferable to what we call evil than we had before. Some day, I doubt not, we shall arrive at an understanding of the evolution of the æsthetic faculty; but all the understanding in the world will neither increase nor diminish the force of the intuition that this is beautiful and that is ugly.

It is well worth our while to take note of such an admission, for it plainly recognises the hopelessness of finding a logical basis for the supreme postulates of human ethics in the laws that regulate the physical nature of man and animals. Not only are those physical laws of no help; they appear to the Professor himself to be in actual antagonism to what man, when he is able to enter into himself, discovers to be right and just and good in the moral sphere. We must explain our meaning in the Professor's own words. They are well worth quoting:

Man, the animal, in fact, has worked his way to the headship of the sentient world, and has become the superb animal which he is, in virtue of his success in the struggle for existence. The conditions having been of a certain order, man's organisation has adjusted itself to them better than that of his competitors in the cosmic strife. In the case of mankind, the self-assertions, the unscrupulous seizing upon all that can be grasped, the tenacious holding of all that can be kept, which constitute the essence of the struggle for existence, have answered.

For his successful progress, as far as the savage state, man has been largely indebted to these qualities which he shares with the ape and the tiger; his exceptional physical organisation; his cunning; his sociability; his curiosity and his imitativeness; his ruthless and ferocious destructiveness when his anger is roused by opposition.

But in proportion as men have passed from anarchy to social organisation, and in proportion as civilisation has grown in worth, these deeply ingrained serviceable qualities have become defects. After the manner of successful persons, civilised man would gladly kick down the ladder by which he has climbed. He would be only too pleased to see "the ape and tiger die." But they decline to suit his convenience: and the unwelcome intrusion of these boon companions of his hot youth into the ranged existence of civil life adds pains and griefs, innumerable and immeasurably great, to those which the cosmic process necessarily brings on the mere animal. In fact, civilised man brands all these ape and tiger promptings with the name of sins; he punishes many of the acts which grow from them as crimes; and in extreme cases he does his best to put an

end to the survival of the fittest of former days by axe and rope. Whatever difference of opinion may exist among experts, there is a general concensus that the ape and tiger methods of the struggle for existence are not reconcilable with sound ethical principles (pp. 5, 6, 7).

Here then we have clearly stated the view of the learned lecturer. He considers that human reason has been the direct outcome of a successful struggle for existence, a struggle rendered successful by the possession of ape and tiger qualities of a superior order. He asserts further that those precious qualities became in time actual defects, and are even now the one great obstacle to the assertion of sound ethical principles amongst us.

We are at once confronted here with several difficulties, which the lecturer considers no doubt beneath his notice since he omits all reference to them.

It follows from his theory that the more our prehistoric ancestor asserted his simian or feline origin by outdoing, like a true man that he already was, the cunning of the ape and the ferocity of the tiger, the more he was elaborating within himself and preparing for his progeny the germs of those milder dispositions and rational promptings which distinguish man in a state of civilisation. Our personal experience is rather different: we find that at present the more a man indulges in "ape and tiger methods," the more like a tiger or an ape he becomes; then, according to Professor Huxley, the case was reversed; those methods led to the acquisition of gentler feelings and to more rational conduct. From this view it would seem to follow that superior "ape and tiger activity" within man has positively resulted, not in a strengthening of the dispositions which led to this activity, but to the weakening of these dispositions together with the eventual production of other dispositions actually antagonistic to them, so that it can be said with Professor Huxley:

what we call goodness or virtue involves a course of conduct which in all respects is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence. In place of ruthless self-assertion it demands self-restraint; in place of thrusting aside or treading down all competitors, it requires that the individual shall not merely respect, but shall help his fellows; its influence is directed, not so much to the survival of the fittest, as to the fitting of as many as possible to survive (p. 33).

Such are the paradoxical assertions to which are driven those who attempt to derive reason from sense, humanity from animality, moral virtue from physical feeling. But the Professor shows more candour than logic when he himself insists, as in the passage just quoted, upon the radical, absolute antagonism that subsists between one state and the other. How then does he hope to reconcile his views with the well-known saying, " *Nemo dat quod non habet* "?

No, we do not believe in the Professor's theory. Indeed, we believe in the struggle he describes—it is only too real; as St. Paul puts it, " *I do not the good which I will, but the evil which I hate that I do.*"* We must believe in that painful struggle; but instead of imagining, like the lecturer, that one combatant has produced his own antagonist, we think it more rational to admit that both adversaries have always coexisted in man, now, alas! as adversaries, once as allies. Nor do we give the name of sins, as the lecturer erroneously suggests, to any ape and tiger motion which for a moment obtains the mastery within us in spite of us. These evil motions, though they are called the " law of sin," because, as Catholic theology teaches, they come from original sin, and violently tempt and incline to sin, nevertheless, as long as our will does not consent to them they are not sins, in the technical sense of the word, because they are not voluntary.

So, curious enough, our doctrine is, in a sense, in more intelligible harmony with the evolutionary principle of the " struggle for existence," than is the view propounded by Professor Huxley himself. A struggle for existence that tends to produce the enfeeblement of the most successful, and to generate the engine of his destruction, would be a misnomer. On the contrary, in our view, the struggle is indeed a struggle for real supremacy, if not for actual existence. The two competitors, animal passion and concupiscence on the one hand and reason on the other, struggle really for the mastery, and the victory of one inevitably carries with it the temporary or permanent weakening of the other. The more play is allowed to one power, the stronger, the more aggressive it becomes; on the contrary, the more subdued it is, the less free its activity is

* Rom. vii. 15.

permitted to be, the feebler, the less formidable will it show itself. All this is just what we should expect, according to ordinary biological laws. The weakening or total loss of sight may immensely increase the sense of hearing or the sense of touch, as commonly happens with the blind, not of course by producing new senses, but by indirectly increasing the physiological demand upon senses already existing. Stimulation in living organisms means growth and development; absence of activity means weakness and ultimate degeneracy, if not disappearance. No one knows this better than Professor Huxley himself. Yet his theory can hardly be reconciled with these biological principles.

Again, we are not told in the lecture how man, full of those successful ape and tiger instincts, that had just brought him specifically to the fore, was led to become social and actually to lay the foundations of his future civilisation. The question is not without certain difficulties. What is there in the nature of things that thus prompted the most anthropoid of all apes, the most splendidly ferocious of all tigers, to become gregarious, pastoral, agricultural, social altogether? If reason dictated such a conduct, then reason, however dim and feeble, must have coexisted in pre-social man with the above-mentioned instincts, acquired qualities if you like; and the first glimmerings of social life must have represented in him a first victory of reason over mere animal impulses. Social instinct may have led to social groupings, it cannot have resulted from them. If, on the contrary, as Professor Huxley teaches (p. 6), "the deeply ingrained serviceable qualities" of the ape and tiger only became defects *after* man's "civilisation had grown in worth," then we are at a loss to understand how those "qualities" ever allowed a social state to be reached at all! They ought to have proved an insuperable obstacle, seeing that the ape and tiger methods are in constant opposition to those ethical principles without which no society can long continue to exist, supposing it can begin to be formed at all. Professor Huxley is here attempting, it seems to us, a hopeless task, just like that statesman who, under the influence of a theory, would attempt to establish peace and order in a country by gathering together into one executive assembly or council the most inflammable, excitable, unprincipled politicians in that country, hoping that out of their

endless quarrels, constant scenes, financial incapacity, and selfish individualism, peace and plenty would at once naturally follow. The Professor was right indeed when he told his audience that cosmic evolution brought us no nearer to a solution of the great ethical puzzle. It only brings us to a standstill. We do not understand how Ethics began to find a home in the human breast, seeing that all in it represented the triumph of methods absolutely opposed to Ethics, according to the theory before us.

It is unnecessary for us to assure our readers that Professor Huxley can lay no claim to originality when he thus affirms the absolute necessity of curbing the ape and tiger instincts within us if we are to attain any degree of ethical perfection. While refuting the opinion of Socrates—namely, that all principles of human action are without any exception or contradiction under the absolute control of reason—St. Thomas of Aquin, following Aristotle, said, many centuries ago :

This hypothesis of Socrates is without foundation, for the senses in us obey indeed the dictates of reason, but not altogether with perfect obedience; hence Aristotle says that reason has over the lower nature of man only a sort of political authority, like that of a master who directs children in whom there resides a certain power to resist his orders.*

Hence, according to the great mediæval philosopher, man, to act rightly, is not only in need of a well-ordered reason, he must also possess (by laborious acquisition in his present circumstances) that well-ordered disposition of his lower nature which good moral habits alone can impart to it. Reason and sense: this dualism of Aristotle and of St. Thomas of Aquin is the only way of escape out of the great difficulty so ably stated by Professor Huxley before his Oxford audience, but left by him hopelessly unsolved after all.

The conclusion of the Professor's lecture is neither cheerful nor encouraging. The theory of evolution, he tells us, with some sadness in his tone, "encourages no millennial anticipations." We cannot arrest by any efforts of our own the inevitable decay in store for us as for everything else in this universe, nor can we "imagine that a few centuries will suffice to subdue the masterfulness (of our human nature) to purely ethical ends." What

* "St. Th. Summa Theol." 1a 2ae. Ques. LVIII. a. 2.

are a few centuries compared with the millions of years that were required to build up our "ape and tiger qualities"! Thus "ethical nature may count upon having to reckon with a tenacious and powerful enemy as long as the world lasts," adds the lecturer, and on this point we entirely agree with him. Here then is failure, cosmic failure painfully but frankly admitted. The force that raised us into being has spent so much time in bringing us up to the present point, that no sufficient time will remain to evolve all the possibilities of our actual state! This is sad indeed. Waste, sheer waste on the most gigantic scale, is then the supreme law of nature. No wonder that the notion of a wise and beneficent Creator is so objectionable to those who can bring themselves to read in this fashion the life of the universe and the laws of progress. This conclusion of the Professor's lecture might be borrowed with advantage by any one engaged in writing an apology of Pessimism. Yet Professor Huxley does not like to leave us under such an impression. He feels somehow that it would not do. He therefore assumes—without attempting to show how the idea flows logically from his premises—he assumes that "the proportion of good and evil in life may be very sensibly affected by human action." Granted; but how can that be without some kind of freewill in man, and how is the notion of freewill reconciled with the "ethics of evolution"? We venture to say that the Professor would have dealt with that very obvious difficulty if he had had the faintest hope of being able to solve it. Anyhow, he declares that "so far forth as we possess a power of bettering things, it is our paramount duty to use it and to train all our intellect and energy to this supreme service of our kind" (p. 31). We know that in the end the whole effort will come to nothing, but we must do something nevertheless. Here poetry comes very opportunely to the rescue to get us over this ugly consideration:

It may be that the gulfs will wash us down,
It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,

. . . . But something ere the end,
Some work of noble note may yet be done.

The *may* which recurs again and again in those lines gives a delightful vagueness to the whole vision, and is

well in keeping with the theory here advocated. But the lecturer "deems it an essential condition of the realisation of that hope that we should cast aside the notion that the escape from pain and sorrow is the proper object of life" (p. 37). Yes, there is the rub. We have to persuade ourselves, at any rate, it would be very advantageous if we could persuade others who toil and labour for us, that that notion must be cast aside. But is there any chance of our succeeding in bringing about such a persuasion among men? Are the ape and tiger promptings within them to be so easily subdued by the cheerless prospects held out to them by the distinguished lecturer? Such advice will not be taken seriously, it will not be endured patiently. A few people, in good social circumstances, with education, sufficient means, and a philosophical turn of mind, may like to entertain these views, and no doubt may find it a pleasant occupation to lecture upon them, but the great mass of the people, uneducated, groaning under the sense of daily wants, and feeling the constant burden of painful, uninteresting labour, will take a very different view of the situation. They will think, and considering the Professor's teaching, very logically too, that to escape pain and sorrow is, if not the whole object of life, at any rate a very considerable object in it, and they will shape their conduct accordingly. It is with ethics as with land-tenure. We cannot feel any desire to spend our time and resources upon valuable improvements, when we cannot tell how long we are likely to remain in undisturbed possession of our holding. We barely live on from day to day, feeling that "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Thus we see that the academic performance of Professor Huxley is fraught with most serious consequences, not only in the sphere of speculative ethics, but also in that of practical sociology. Of the propriety of supplying such intellectual and moral food to young men at present studying at one of our great Universities, much doubt has, perhaps, already arisen in the minds of our readers. Is this healthy teaching for those who are only beginning to face life and its responsibilities? Is it calculated to deepen their sense of duty, their sympathy for their fellow-men, and their love of work? or is it not more likely to leave them aimless, discouraged, and a prey to the insidious suggestions of flesh and blood? The truth is the truth, some

will say, and there is no good in disguising it. Quite so, but this remark only applies to those verities, so assured, so carefully tested and so universally recognised that it would be mere hypocrisy to pretend to ignore them. Will anyone seriously say that the conclusions propounded by Professor Huxley last month in the Sheldonian Theatre belong to the category of demonstrated theorems? Are they not rather mere speculative views which have been familiar to men for much more than 2000 years; views which nearly every philosophical school has discussed and examined, attacked or defended; views which have occurred almost inevitably to every man who has given himself, even superficially, to the study of the great problems of life; views that are always with us but never take final hold of mankind because, in the end, mankind seems to recoil almost instinctively from their terrible ethical consequences? No! such views do not form a proper subject for an academic display. They may still supply, and no doubt will supply, material for discussions in philosophical clubs and debating societies, as long as the world lasts, but a very different sound ought to be given by men in Professor Huxley's position when lecturing in such a place as the Sheldonian Theatre at Oxford. Intellectual superiority and moral influence lay very grave responsibilities upon the shoulders of these amongst us who happen to possess them. We cannot, therefore, help regretting that the Professor, in his "Romanes Lecture," did not more carefully attend to his own principle, namely, the duty of using every means in our power to affect the proportion of good and evil in this life (p. 30), to increase the good and to diminish the evil. This was no doubt the Professor's intention; he failed, perhaps, because he, in common with those who share his opinions, possesses no criterion whereby to know for certain what will finally tell in favour of good or of evil in human action; in other words, what is ultimately tending in this life towards real human happiness. We are but as the blind leading the blind when deprived of the light which is able "to enlighten every man that cometh into this world."

L. M. BAYNARD KLEIN.

ART. VII.—QUEEN ELIZABETH AND THE REVOLUTION.

I.—HER INTRIGUES WITH THE HUGUENOTS, 1558–1563.

MANY years ago, the Protestant historian Guizot gave proof of much honest discrimination, when he expressed his conviction that the religious crisis of the sixteenth century was not merely a religious, but essentially a revolutionary movement.* It would be well if the champions of the so-called continuity of the Church of England and its oneness with the Catholic Church of pre-Reformation times, would consent to profit by the learning of their co-religionist and cease to fight for a position which has over and over again been clearly proved untenable.

Among all the arguments brought forward by the Reformers, it never once occurred to any of them to pretend, either in England or abroad, that the change they had effected was not a radical change. The word Catholic, so dear to the Anglican heart, was an abomination to them.

So long, said Admiral Coligny, as the Queen of England stands fast in the Protestant religion, so long will many States of Christendom decline from Catholic religion, and especially her countenance will be the occasion that France being won thereto, the rest of Christendom shall follow.

If the revolutionary character of the Reformation was disguised at home by the protection lent to it by the throne, Elizabeth's foreign policy and her alliance with traitors and rebels in France and the Netherlands show beyond all doubt, that revolt from hitherto recognised authority, spiritual and temporal, was the very backbone of the movement.

In France, the Huguenots were far less a sect than an army. They were divided into twenty-four groups, each having six chiefs, to whom they paid a yearly tribute of 800,000 francs. They could muster in four weeks from seven to eight thousand horse, and twenty-five thousand foot soldiers, a number which

* “La Civilisation en Europe,” p. 356.

the King of France could not bring into the field in less than four months.* According to Michele, the Venetian envoy, obedience to their superiors was exacted with greater severity than among the Turks.

I am at a loss, wrote Tavannes in his Memoirs, what to call the Huguenot faction; it is not altogether a popular nor altogether an aristocratic movement, but is both in a measure. It is a republic in a monarchy, of which it will work the ruin, neither being able to continue its existence without the destruction of the other.

Carrero, another Venetian envoy, divided the Huguenots into nobles, burghers, and the people, the first-class being simply ambitious, the second lucre-loving, the third ignorant.

Their spiritual guides sprang from the people, were animated with a blind fanaticism, and taught openly that taxes were an abomination, that nobility was a delusion, and that feudal exactions were non-biblical. They urged their hearers no longer to live and die, as their ancestors had done, in besotted ignorance of the people's sovereignty.† Such words would not have seemed out of place in the mouths of the Sans Culottes and Terrorists of 1792. One day Francis I. was threatening to imitate the example of Henry VIII. "Sir," replied the Papal legate, "you would lose more than the Pope, for a new religion requires a new king."‡

At first the Huguenots had laid claim to religious toleration in self-defence; but as they grew stronger, they gradually dropped the plea, and when opportunity presented itself, were more pitiless towards Catholics than Catholics had ever been towards them. It was one of their tenets, that should the king prove hostile to the reform, he was to be treated as the obscurest of criminals, hence the doctrine of tyrannicide taught at Geneva, and developed in the writings attributed to Theodore Beza.

This celebrated Huguenot belonged to a respectable French family; his father, a devout Catholic, had educated him for the priesthood, and he took his licentiate degree at the age of twenty. Although not yet in holy orders he held several benefices *in commendam* according to the lax custom of the day. From

* Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, "Les Huguenots et les Gueux," vol. i. p. 31.

† Monluc, "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 366.

‡ Brantôme, vol. iv. p. 294.

his master, Melchoir Wolmar, who introduced the principles of the Reformation into France, he imbibed his first notions of heresy, and became subsequently one of the most influential and eloquent disciples of Calvin. He was, indeed, next to Calvin, the moving spirit of the Huguenot faction ; all that was done by them was directly or indirectly the result of Beza's influence, and he had attained this remarkable power over men's minds as much by his learning, wit and zeal, as by his unscrupulous choice of means for the furtherance of the new gospel. He was fond of quoting the Bible, but ancient Roman history was made to serve the Huguenot cause even better, for without any distortion of the text, he could point to the assassination of the tyrant Cæsar, by Brutus the patriot. Agrippa d'Aubigné was also in the habit of recommending a book entitled "Junius Brutus, or a Means of Defence against Tyrants," a work which treated of the limits of obedience due to kings, and of the circumstances under which it was allowable to take arms against them.

In August 1559, a secret assembly was held at Vendôme, composed of the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, Coligny and his brothers, together with other prominent Huguenots. Their chief subject of deliberation was a proposed rising, in order to deliver the King Francis II. from the so-called oppression of the Guises ; in other words, to usurp the authority exercised by the king's uncles, and to wield it themselves. The king was to be in reality a prisoner in their hands, and all the Guises were to perish. Coligny promised the support of the whole Protestant party, but even then the number of troops which the rebels could bring into the field would be insufficient without the help of the Queen of England, because Philip II. was always to be reckoned with, in a question of the defence of the Church and the monarchical principle. He would, they knew, be ready with a strong contingent of men and money, and double the actual resources of the King of France. A little later, a more important assembly met at Nantes, consisting of Huguenot zealots, and personal enemies of the Guises. Barry, called La Renaudie, was their chosen representative. An ex-Catholic, convicted of forgery, he had been set at liberty by the Duke of Guise, and allowed to retire into Switzerland, from whence he had gone to England, where Elizabeth had given

him tokens of her favour. To him, according to Castelnau, was confided the mission of exterminating the whole Guise family. Some of the conspirators went so far as to declare that the entire line of Henry II. who had so cruelly persecuted the Gospel must be sacrificed, and a new monarch inflamed with the Divine Word set up in their place. By this they meant that Condé should be raised to the throne. Their plan was to seize the king, then at the Château of Blois; but the conspiracy was so badly organised that the plot was discovered immediately; the king removed to his strong castle of Amboise, and a number of the rebels were captured before even an attempt was made on the fortress. Some were executed, but many escaped to form new plots and finally to deluge France with blood.

Meanwhile Catholic Europe was standing at gaze, astounded at Elizabeth's audacity. Paul IV. thought it incredible that a bastard should have any pretension to a throne which was considered a fief of the Holy See, and his attitude was not such as to mollify her. For two years after her accession, the Venetian Government was totally unrepresented in England, and this state of things would probably have continued much longer, had not the Venetian merchants resident in London, fearing the extinction of their trade, elected a vice-consul on their own responsibility. The King of Spain, it is true, was willing to overlook the stain on her birth, and was even ready to marry her, but she must first pledge herself to remain faithful to the religion she had sworn that she professed. But to win either the Pope or Philip necessitated acts of humiliation, to which Elizabeth was by nature averse. She weighed the relative advantages of submission and defiance, and concluded that even alone she would be a match for all her enemies. Her effrontery, combined with the ability and unscrupulousness of her Ministers, succeeded in such a manner as to render her, within a short time a power in Europe. Contempt was turned into respect for her cleverness and fear of her cunning, if not into admiration for her conduct and policy. At this distance of time, it is clear to those who do not wilfully blind themselves, that every one of Elizabeth's public actions bears the distinct mark of revolution. Not only did she resolve to swim with the tide of innovation that had set in,

but having committed herself to the Revolution she became the enemy of all that was stable. She would have no Church of hers founded on the immutable Rock of Peter, and she had as little reverence for monarchical institutions as for the Papacy. Her strength, she knew well, lay not in any confraternity with the crowned heads of Europe, but in her own indomitable will, leagued with the new spirit of restless unfaith which claimed for itself licence to question all law both human and divine. Thus, however much Elizabeth might play the despot at home, she could only hope to make her power felt abroad by means of intrigue. The circumstances of her accession played into the hands of the Huguenots, and furnished them with an opportunity of open revolt. For thirty years they had gloried in persecution, making immense capital out of their sufferings, but with the advent of Elizabeth, their protestations of submission and loyalty came to an end, and the first-fruits of their emancipation are to be seen in the above-mentioned conspiracy of Amboise.

Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, the English ambassador in Paris, with a shrewdness equal to Elizabeth's own, saw at once the advantage that might be gained by secretly espousing the cause of the Huguenots, while he appeared to be on the side of loyalty and order. It must, however, be owned that the disguise was of the thinnest, and that before long he was suspected of connivance with the rebels. Concerned in various plots under Queen Mary, he had been tried for high treason and acquitted, although public opinion still pronounced him guilty. He was at Westminster at the time of Mary's death, snatched the royal ring from her finger, and hastened with it to Hatfield. Active, adventurous, unscrupulous, and according to the Spanish ambassador, adapted for any nefarious intrigue, he perceived that the divisions from which France was suffering might become the foundation of England's future greatness. His correspondence with Elizabeth and Cecil contains some of the most interesting relics of the age. For importance, his letters may rank with Chapuys' despatches in the reign of Henry VIII., although in Throckmorton, the man of the world and the courtier being swamped in the politician, his communications, startling though they are, will be found wanting in the fascination of Chapuys' lively gossip. They introduce us into

a labyrinth of plots and counter-plots, but while events take place as it were before our very eyes, the actors in the drama are either veiled or headless statues, for he is scarcely ever to be diverted from business for an instant, to record a *bon mot*, or describe a person, or give that playful or sarcastic or sympathetic touch which breathed life into the people about whom Chapuys wrote. Throckmorton is totally devoid of humour as he is lacking in resources. While the Imperial envoy knew a hundred devices for toying with an awkward question, keeping the shuttlecock jumping up and down on his own battledore, till it suited him to send it whizzing back to his adversary's, Throckmorton had no other way out of a difficulty but by telling a lie or by going to bed and feigning illness. Neither was his patriotism of that lofty type which scorns to arrive at a noble end by ignoble means, and if he dreamed of the restoration of Calais, that once brightest jewel of England's crown, he cared little by what loss of honour the restoration was brought about. In truth, chivalry and highmindedness were a little out of date when Elizabeth mounted the throne.

Our divisions, says Castelnau,* have been fomented and kept up by the perpetual intercourse Throckmorton had with the Admiral and those of his party. A man of great energy, he took the occasion by storm, neglecting all that belonged to the office of an ambassador, who ought to maintain peace and amity, to side against the king, persuading the Queen of England that her opportunity lay in the quarrels of the French, and that she would have not only Normandy, but also the greater part of the kingdom of France, to which the kings of England had formerly so much pretension, and which they lost by the union of the French people!

The grievance was well founded. On March 21, 1560, Throckmorton wrote to Elizabeth: "The moment has come to throw our money about; it will never have been spent more usefully."†

The chief means he employed in his efforts to extract money from his parsimonious mistress was the fanning of her resentment against the Guises for having proposed, on the accession of Francis II., that he should be proclaimed King of England. To Throckmorton's very natural disgust, whenever he dined at

* "Memoirs," I. v. ch. i.

† Forbes. "Public Transactions," under this date.

the French Court, he was obliged to eat off plate bearing the arms of England, France and Scotland quartered, with the style: "Francis and Mary, by the grace of God, King and Queen of France, Scotland, England, and Ireland." Nevertheless, he was not ignorant that the English sovereigns had quartered the arms of France ever since they had possessed an inch of French soil; and he was well aware that to none but Elizabeth, sensitive as she was to the stain on her birth, and to any questioning of her right to reign, would the pretext constitute a sufficient ground of complaint. He was, however, determined to make the most of it, and assured the Queen that the assumption of her arms by the French monarchs was no mere empty show, but that they were resolved to prosecute Mary Stuart's title to England, and that his mistress's service would not be much set back if she licensed him to come over to her, post haste, to speak with her, as in these cases he could not well commit to writing what he had to say. He added that he had seen the like done in cases of less moment in her father's time. If she consented to his leaving, he desired to know whether he was to make the French King privy, or to accomplish the journey covertly.*

He wrote to Cecil in the same strain, but rather more at length, according to his custom. The result of this communication was a letter from Elizabeth, dated October 11, 1559, telling him to come to England to visit his wife, who was "sick with ague, and in more fear than danger," they trusted. And he was to come by post to see her, for her comfort and remedy; and as this might seem somewhat strange to the French King and his Ministers, she commanded him to declare the matter to his Majesty, the Cardinal of Lorraine, or the Duke of Guise. He was not to remain in England more than four or five days, and was to return to his place with like speed.† Cecil kept up the fiction by remarking to Throckmorton on the Queen's goodness to his wife, who indeed, was not so well in health as Cecil could wish.

The upshot of this interesting visit does not transpire; but Throckmorton went to England again in January 1560, and on

* Stevenson, "Cal. State Papers," Foreign Series, Sept. 24, 1559.

† Forbes, i. 251.

his return to Paris, wrote to Elizabeth's Council, warning them against the men who ruled France, and hoping that the Queen "will beat the iron while it is hot, and show her greatness."*

On another occasion, he urges that the English never had a better time "to do with these men" than the present, not only to bring them to terms, but to provide that "thereafter we have little cause to fear them," and he hopes that "the Queen will not stick at the spending of a little money in sending to and fro."

Throckmorton's absences, in spite of the dust thrown in the eyes of the French Government, gave rise to suspicion. The Cardinal of Lorraine told him that they had given the world matter to talk, and to think that the amity between the King of France and Queen of England was somewhat doubtful. After some awkward fencing on Throckmorton's part, and bitter complaint on the Cardinal's, the latter detailed the manner in which Elizabeth had supported the French rebels, who by a parliament of a few, sought to order the kingdom for themselves, wherefore the King, for example's sake and for his own honour, was constrained to use force against them. He further asked what there was in this, that could be construed into want of friendship for the Queen of England? Might they not chastise their rebels without offence to her? Throckmorton answered that he did not know that the Huguenots were rebels, and that the English had great cause to doubt the preparations of the French for war, however the Cardinal might colour the same. Finally, the Cardinal asked whether Elizabeth meant to assist the rebels in their doings, "which it would not be well for her to do, for divers respects," and Throckmorton assured him that there was *no speaking of it as contained in his instructions.*

The English ambassador then made a formal complaint on the subject of the Queen of France bearing the arms of England. The Cardinal appeared to be much surprised at the grievance, asking why, if the Queen of England bore those of France, should not his mistress quarter the English arms, being of the same House? Throckmorton then asked what had moved the kings of France in times past to ascribe the arms of England

* Stevenson, "Cal. State Papers," Foreign Series, 1560-1. No. 685.

to themselves, and the Cardinal replied that being at war with England, they spared nothing that might touch the honour of the English. "But," exclaimed Throckmorton, "they were at war with Mary; why, then, should they offer this insult to Elizabeth, by whose means they have peace?"

He went on to protest that if Elizabeth had consulted her own interests more than the peace of Christendom, she might have retaken Calais, and King Philip would then have made no peace without England. The Cardinal knew, he said, what interest England would have had in the continuance of the war, being joined with so puissant a Prince.

"Here," observed Throckmorton, "he (the Cardinal) put his finger to his nose, and scratched it, where I think it did not itch."*

But throw what dust he might, the English ambassador did not deceive the Guises, who were well informed of his transactions with the Huguenots. Nevertheless, the interview ended with protestations of friendship on both sides, and afterwards Throckmorton had an audience with the King, and presented Elizabeth's letters. Francis inquired politely whether his mistress were fond of hawking and hunting, and without appearing to give the interview anything of a business character, contrived to sandwich between remarks purely ceremonious, a request that the French hostages might be remembered. He was then taken to the Queen mother, with whom was present the young Queen Mary Stuart. After some compliments exchanged with Catherine, the ambassador turned to Mary, who exclaimed: "The Queen, my good sister, may be assured to have a better neighbour of me, being her cousin, than of the rebels, and so I pray you signify unto her." This might equally apply to France and to Scotland, for Elizabeth's policy was singularly consistent in all that related to foreign matters, being a very simple process of stirring up strife between subjects and their lawful rulers. Her answer was with her accustomed vagueness, that she wished all causes likely to breed dissension between herself and the French King redressed. She complained of the assumption of her style and arms by his wife, and gave her ambassador power to appoint commissioners

* Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Feb. 27, 1560. R. O.

to treat of the subject. She next expressed her willingness to disarm if Francis recalled his forces from Scotland; and if the Scotch nobles refused to live in obedience to the French King and his wife, she promised to use her persuasion or authority to induce them to do so. The discussion ended at last, but with mutual distrust, the French continuing to arm themselves by sea and land, the English cruisers boarding and plundering French ships with impunity, while Elizabeth's promises regarding the rebels remained sterile.

Meanwhile, the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Duke of Guise wrote to the Queen Dowager of Scotland, saying that Elizabeth kept them in constant alarm lest she should begin the war, showing by all her dealings with them that she was "stirring the coals." Nevertheless, she had given them "the fairest words in the world, whereunto the King of France has not so much trusted, but that he has informed the King of Spain of all that she has done."

Matters of religion, they went on to say, had gone so far in France that within the last twelve or eighteen days, a plot had been discovered to kill them both, seize the King, and give him masters and governors to bring him up "in that wretched doctrine."

Many, however, had been taken prisoners, and they hoped now that the matter was "bolted out and the danger avoided."^{*} This referred to the famous conspiracy of Amboise, for which Elizabeth was so largely responsible.

But in spite of all that had been done in France by the rebels, on the strength of her understanding with them, she did not "stir the coals" enough to please Throckmorton.

In order to induce her to take some definite course, he wrote that the Guises had a pestilent and horrible device to poison her by means of an Italian named Stefano, "a burly man with a black beard, about forty-five years of age," who had gone into Germany, and thence into England, to offer his services to the Queen as engineer. We hear no more of this terrible black bogey, but Throckmorton and others knew well the particular shape Elizabeth's fears assumed, and whenever it was desirable to rouse her to a decision some such

* Stevenson, "Cal. State Papers," 1560. No. 879.

story as this had to be invented. It became at last so common a stratagem to declare that the Catholics had a plot for poisoning her saddle, her gloves, or her shoes, or that the agents of Philip and the Guisés went about with envenomed daggers lying in wait for her, that it is a wonder she did not grow incredulous from constant repetition of the same stories. Her terror of assassination was as long-lived and unreasoning as her vanity, and it seems to have been as difficult for her to give people credit for ordinary good faith and honesty, as it was for her to express herself simply or to act unequivocally.

It was inevitable that rumours should reach the French Court of the scandals which were taking place in Elizabeth's household, and Throckmorton, writing with real or feigned indignation to the Marquis of Northampton,* wishes that he "were dead or hence," that he might not hear "the dis honourable and naughty reports made of the Queen, which every hair of my head stareth at, and my ears glow to hear." He is almost at his wit's end and knows not what to say.

One, he says, laugheth at us, another threateneth, another revileth the Queen. Some let not to say, "What religion is this, that a subject shall kill his wife, and the Prince not only bear withal but marry with him, rehearsing the father and grandfather."

He goes on to say :

All the estimation the English had got is clean gone, and the infamy passes the same so far, as his heart bleeds to think upon the slanderous bruits he hears, which if they be not slaked, *or if they be true*, their reputation is gone for ever, war follows, and utter subversion of the Queen and country.

He concludes by begging his correspondent to slake these rumours, praying that God may not suffer the Queen to be *opprobrium hominum et objectio publicis*, and takes his leave with weeping eyes.

On the same day that this letter was written, Killigrew, the Scottish ambassador, in answer to a complaint of Throckmorton's, writes to him :

I cannot imagine what rumours they be you hear there, as you write so strange, unless such as were here, of the death of my Lady Dudley, for that she brake her neck down a pair of stairs, which I protest unto

* Stevenson, "Cal. State Papers," No. 623. Oct. 10, 1560.

[No. 7 of Fourth Series.]

you was done only by the hand of God, to my knowledge. But who can let men to speak and think in such cases.

On October 15, he again writes that there were "lewd rumours," but that "nothing could be more false," and on the 17th, he adds that they were "very rife" in England, but that the Queen had said "she would make them false."

Nothing, however, was done to punish those who circulated the reports, and naturally weak denials only acted as stimulants. Throckmorton was beside himself with mortification, and reiterated his entreaties that the tongues might be silenced, declaring that, "if the bruits respecting the death of Lady Dudley and the Queen's marriage with Lord Robert," were not silenced, God and religion would be out of estimation, the Queen discredited, and the country ruined and made a prey.*

To Chamberlain, Elizabeth's ambassador in Spain, he writes on the 20th of October, that his friends tell him the Lord Robert's wife is dead, and has by mischance broken her own neck, but that in Paris it was openly bruited her neck was broken "by such other appurtenances," as he is withal brought to be weary of his life, and so evil are the reports that he is ashamed to write them.

Throckmorton was shrewd enough to know that these reports could not be without foundation: hence the reproachful bitterness of his tone, so much more prominent in his letters than any indignation at the malice of slanderous tongues. But, however good the grounds were for concluding that Lady Dudley's death had been compassed by her husband and his paramour, the tongues were apparently at fault in relating that Elizabeth was already married to Dudley. If she ever did marry him, the event probably took place in 1562. The Spanish ambassador, Alvaro de Quadra, Bishop of Aquila, in whom the bishop was almost entirely merged in the diplomat, secretly favoured Dudley's ambition from purely political motives. The favourite's hopes rose and fell with the arrival and departure of every fresh suitor for his mistress's hand, but he considered himself within measurable distance of reaching the coveted prize when at length he succeeded in obtaining a conditional promise from Philip II. that he would help him to

* Stevenson, "Cal. State Papers," No. 685.

win it. The condition was that Dudley should undertake to recognise the authority of the Council, to which all Europe was now anxiously looking forward. On the feast of St. John the Baptist, 1561, he invited the Queen to a splendid fête on the Thames. Together with the Spanish ambassador, they entered a magnificently decorated barge, and there the greetings exchanged between the two lovers seem to have called forth some perfectly well-grounded scruples on the part of de Quadra. Dudley, seeing the prelate's abashed look, and turning towards Elizabeth, exclaimed, "As we have a bishop on board, why should he not marry us?" De Quadra replied that he would do so willingly, but that the Queen must first re-establish religion, and shake off the yoke which was weighing upon her and upon England, for it had come to this, that she found it impossible to marry without Cecil's permission.*

Rather more than a year after this episode, it was positively asserted that a secret marriage had been performed at the house of the Earl of Pembroke, where Elizabeth and Dudley had spent the day together. On her return to the palace with him the same evening, her ladies asked her whether they might not also kiss his hand, to which she replied evasively, that they were not to believe all they heard.†

Meanwhile, Francis II. had died, and the crown of France had devolved on his brother, a child only ten years old. In England it was expected that Catherine de Medici, who had enjoyed but little power under the government of her eldest son, now being supreme, would have chosen the King of Navarre for her principal adviser. She did in effect make advances towards him, but committed herself to no policy until it was clear to her on which side her interest lay. She professed indeed to uphold the Guises, who, if they were ambitious, were ever found loyal to the king, the country, and the Church; but at the same time she raised the hopes of the Huguenots by affecting to consult Coligny in matters of some weight and importance. She was quite prepared to go much further, if fortune turned the scale in their favour.

"Would you continue to obey the King if he became a

* The Bishop of Aquila to Philip, June 30, 1561. Belgian Archives.

† The Bishop of Aquila to Cardinal Granvelle, July 11, 1562. *Ibid.*

Huguenot?" she asked of the Constable of France and the Marshals St. André and de Brissac.

"No," they had replied; and by their firmness perhaps saved France from a line of heretical kings.

In the south, where the Huguenots were the most numerous, they showed that they had nothing to fear. They assembled freely, knowing themselves to be secure, thanks to their relations with Elizabeth and her faithful agent, Throckmorton. At Vassy, the Duke of Guise was insulted, and wounded by a stone thrown at him during a Huguenot sermon in the open air. His servants retorted by drawing their swords. It was the beginning of the civil war. Everywhere, the Huguenots donned the white casaque, the badge of their cavalry. Having assembled at La Ferté-sous-Jouarre, Condé led them to Orleans, and the famous city of "La Pucelle" became the capital of Huguenot France.

The Duke of Guise held Paris, which was Catholic to the core, for the king, who remained at the Louvre with the Queen Regent. The relations between mother and son at this period were unnatural in the extreme. Catherine was more than a match for the Queen of England in her duplicity and cruelty, and there is one point in her character which overlaps all we know of Elizabeth's potentialities of wickedness—namely, her systematic persecution of her second son. During the life of Francis II. she had confided him to the care of a Huguenot nurse, thinking that in order to balance parties in the State it would be well to make the king's brother chief of the Huguenots. Francis dying without issue, Charles became king, and his governor, M. de Cipierre, seeing that he showed signs of noble qualities and the stuff of which great kings are made, talked to him of nothing but glory and greatness. Later on, his tutor, Jacques Amyot, fostered his love of arms and the taste for literature, which he preserved through all the storms of his short and troubled life. But Catherine trembled for her own power in seeing him develop capacities which would shortly enable him to take the reins of government into his own hands, and she conceived the diabolical plan of stunting his intelligence and stifling all that was noblest in his nature. She removed him from all his former surroundings, and placed him under the care of the Italian Gondi, with instructions that he was to darken and lower the boy's

intellect, and cultivate his grosser instincts. It must be owned that Gondi carried out these instructions faithfully. He taught him to swear and to blaspheme, to flatter and betray. For his intellectual studies he substituted jumping and racing. The practice of arms was neglected, and Charles lost his bodily grace and dexterity, and became rough, awkward and boorish. He was encouraged to pass his time in playing blind man's buff, and other childish games, and his natural inclination for study was ridiculed. He became violent, lazy, and averse to mental effort of any kind. More cruelty was to follow, for while pride and vanity were fostered by every means, he was deprived of the innocence which belonged of right to his tender age.

Later on, knowing that as a result of this training, every duty would give way to the young king's inordinate passion for hunting, Catherine fixed those days for the assembling of her council on which she ascertained that he had decided to hunt. In this manner she could count on his never being present when she transacted the business of the State. All this was done that Catherine might enjoy to the full her lust of power, and that the Duke of Anjou, her favourite son, small in stature, small in mind, and small even in his vices, might profit by the imbecility inculcated in Charles.* The Duke of Anjou was brought up to look with favour on the Huguenots, through whose suffrages he was to attain renown. "I am the little Huguenot," he was accustomed to say; "soon I shall be the great Huguenot."

While Condé was playing the king at Orleans, the Parliament declared the rebels guilty of high treason, and condemned them to death, confiscating their goods. In vain did Condé protest and appeal to Elizabeth and Throckmorton. Not content with either protests or appeals he busied himself at Orleans with coining money with the gold and silver of altar vessels, and melting the church bells to provide himself with cannon.† According to Mézeray, the sacrileges everywhere committed by the Huguenots roused in the people feelings of horror and indignation, for in all places where they

* Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, "Les Huguenots et les Gueux," vol. ii. p. 5 *et seq.*; Brantôme, vol. v. p. 240; vol. iii. p. 287.

† Niccolo Tornabuoni, July 6, 1562.

had become masters, they smashed the images of saints, threw their relics to the winds, profaned the altars and the sacraments, and outraged priests and religious, so that all that history has recorded of the horrors perpetrated by the Goths was effaced by the atrocities of the Huguenots.

If Condé was more prominently active at this time, Coligny was by no means idle. In the course of the year 1561, he had several interviews with Throckmorton in the forest of Fontainebleau. In one of these he confided to the English ambassador all that had passed in a recent meeting of the Council, scrupulously begging that Elizabeth alone might be informed of his revelations, as he had been lately reproached with revealing State secrets.*

In the midst of these calamities, Catherine, who was very well informed of Throckmorton's intrigues, seemed at one moment disposed to chastise the traitors. She sent an army against Condé, commanded by the Duke of Guise, and appealed to Philip for help against the enemies of France and the Church. The army was allowed to advance as far as Châteaudun, and the negotiations with Philip had gone beyond mere preliminaries, when it occurred to her that to call in the Spaniards was a pill too bitter to be swallowed, and she resolved on an interview with Condé. She made a clever, and for the moment a successful appeal to his patriotism, so that, struck with remorse, he declared himself vanquished.† So sure was Catherine now of victory, and of a reconciliation with the Huguenots, that she caused a *Te Deum* to be sung at Vincennes, and the Spanish negotiations came to an abrupt end. But Condé was not proof against Coligny's fanaticism, backed by Theodore Beza, who accused him vehemently of faithlessness to a work begun by God himself. Condé was wax in Beza's hands; he repudiated all his promises to the Queen Mother, and declared himself in favour of a continuance of the war, while Beza went to Germany and thence into Switzerland to recruit soldiers for the impending campaign.‡

Catherine was stupefied at the result of her policy, but

* Throckmorton to Cecil, April 17, 1562. La Ferrière, "Le XVIe. siècle et les Valois," p. 52.

† "Mézeray," vol. iii. p. 78.

‡ Throckmorton to Cecil, July 23, 1562.

Charles, furious at losing such a valuable prize, was in favour of making terms with the Huguenots at the price of any humiliation. "Condé," he exclaimed petulantly, "is one of the arms of my body; my body needs his two arms."* The gain to the Huguenots was immense, and they were not slow to profit by their advantages. From this moment there is a marked increase in the insolence of their tone, and the high-handedness of their cruelties. Coligny, writing to his brother from Orleans, says: "We have hung the curé of Saint Paterne; we treat the Papists differently now to what we used, and we have resolved not to spare them in future." He told him to take advantage of all the means that presented themselves, the sack of Paris being one of them. Hotman, moreover, informed the Elector Palatine, as an inducement to him to send reinforcements, that Condé would give the city up to the Germans to pillage, adding that such a prospect ought to attract large numbers of them.

Although the Germans were to have Paris, the English share of the booty was by no means inconsiderable. In return for the help Elizabeth had promised, she was to fortify the cities of Normandy, and to keep them for herself, Rouen, Havre and Dieppe, being accounted by Throckmorton as good as Calais, and worth fighting for.† Hitherto all the negotiations between Elizabeth and the Huguenots had been of a tentative nature; henceforth they assumed a more determined character, and a deputation was sent from Condé, composed of the Vidame de Chartres, Briquemart, and La Haye, to treat formally of the invasion of France by the English. This was followed by the more important embassy of the Cardinal de Châtillon, of infamous memory. It must be admitted that the main bulk of the Huguenot party, rebels though they were, had the greatest horror of bringing the enemy of their country into France; nevertheless the necessity of such an act was preached to them from every pulpit, and with such vigour that they had no choice but to stifle their scruples. If possible, additional turpitude is added to the proceedings by the fact that in an interview which took place between Throckmorton

* Chautonay, June 17, 1562. Nat. Arch., Paris, 1498.

† Throckmorton to Elizabeth, July 27, 1562.

and Chautonnay, brother of Cardinal Granvelle, the English ambassador took pains to assure him that the Queen of England intended to remain neutral, at the very time that she was haggling with the French rebels over the price of Calais. Catherine's behaviour was even less edifying. Her want of energy in punishing such of the disaffected as fell into her hands, caused suspicion that she secretly favoured them, and it was remarked that she was constantly surrounded by professed or secret Huguenots. But they set little store by her favour, considering her supposed leanings toward them, and her hesitation to chastise, as mere confessions of weakness. All their hope lay in Elizabeth, however much she trifled with them and sought to evade the day of reckoning. Besides a large sum of money, they called upon her to supply ten thousand foot, and as many horse soldiers. This she declared to be excessive, and would only undertake to send six thousand infantry, no cavalry at all, and no more than a third of the subsidy they demanded.* Finally, by the terms of the treaty of Hampton Court, which was signed on the 20th of September, 1562, Elizabeth agreed to pay Condé 100,000 gold crowns, in exchange for which she was to fortify and hold the town of Hâvre until he should put her in possession of the most brilliant jewel of the French crown, the celebrated town and fortress of Calais.†

In England an official proclamation gave out that the army which stood in readiness to cross the Channel was to be sent into France for the sole purpose of succouring Charles IX., while a second proclamation announced that the English troops were about to occupy certain ports on the coast of Normandy, in order that being so close to England they should not fall into the hands of those who would constitute a danger to the country. The Queen's intention was not, the proclamation went on, to make war on the King of France, but to defend the towns and ports nearest to England against the first authors of the troubles on the other side of the Channel, against those who had placed themselves above the King, and who wished to pursue their unjust and violent designs against England.‡

* Forbes, vol. ii. p. 35.

† Harl. MSS. vol. ii. p. 177.

‡ Cotton MSS: Calig. E.V. fol. 174, B. M.

A third proclamation declared that Elizabeth was minded to assure liberty of conscience in France, protect the Christian king, her very good brother, and his subjects, and her own realm.* This sounded plausible, and was greedily devoured in England, but Throckmorton told Elizabeth, that Condé was well aware that the Huguenot name would be covered with infamy if the King lost the flower of the Duchy of Normandy.† And the Cardinal of Lorraine expressed not only a national feeling, but one in accordance with universal right reason and good faith, when he declared Condé and Coligny to be traitors, by the fact of their introducing into France the greatest and oldest enemies of their country.

Charles IX. had just made his triumphal entry into Bourges, reconquered by the Duke of Guise, when the news arrived that the English had landed. The Queen Regent was still bent on negotiating, but the Duke of Guise dictated to the young king a letter to Elizabeth full of dignity and unanswerable logic, throwing upon her the responsibility of the war, and remonstrating with her for harbouring the Vidame de Chartres and the other seditious envoys of the Huguenots, in spite of the conditions of the treaty of Cateau Cambrésis. He then led the French army towards Rouen, to prevent, if possible, the occupation of the ancient capital of Normandy by the English, already in possession of Dieppe. As for the Vidame, he was, he confessed, "sad usque ad mortem," to be obliged to deliver up his country to foreigners, and added, "ego deficio sub onere," admitting that the Huguenots had accepted the sacrifice of their honour. Later on, a good pension from Elizabeth appeared to dispel his sadness and to satisfy his conscience.‡

Meanwhile the Duke of Guise pressed the siege of Rouen. The Huguenots, who held the town, awaited in vain the arrival of the Germans, and in vain Lord Grey, under cover of the night, introduced five hundred English soldiers into the fortress; resistance was only prolonged for a few days, and the place was taken by storm on the 25th of October. The King of Navarre was killed in the mêlée.

* La Ferrière, "La XVI^e siècle et les Valois," p. 76.

† Throckmorton to the Queen, Sept. 24, 1562.

‡ "Le XVI^e siècle et les Valois," p. 79.

While these scenes were being enacted in Normandy, Condé was leading an army, strengthened by German Reiters, towards the walls of Paris. A prayer, composed by Theodore Beza, was recited every day in the camp, to call down the blessing of God on the Huguenot Prince. "They hoped," said Throckmorton, "to restore order in the capital;" that is to say, "to sack it," according to Coligny's promise to the Germans. This was easier said than done, for Condé never succeeded in doing more than harass the outskirts; the Huguenots had few friends in Paris, and the hopes of their leader continued to lie on the coast of Normandy. On the 21st of November he wrote to Lord Robert Dudley that God, having given him the grace to arrive within eight or nine hours of Paris, he awaited further succour from England. The reply was a letter from Cecil to his agent Thomas Smith: "You can tell the Prince of Condé that the money promised him will be at the Hâvre in ten days."* But by this time the Huguenots had learnt that Elizabeth was far more ready to pay in men than in money, and acting on Coligny's advice, Condé resolved to raise the siege of Paris, and make his way into Normandy where, thanks to reinforcements from England, and a fresh levy of Germans, they flattered themselves they would retake Rouen. On the 10th of December, therefore, Condé's soldiers set fire to their quarters and marched on Dreux. The Catholic army had also been strengthened with a contingent of Spanish troops; but even at this advanced stage of affairs the Queen Regent could not be induced to act with firmness or to give up her one refrain at every crisis—negotiation. She still relied on her power to soften Condé's heart towards his country, and a message to him having proved unavailing, she sought a personal interview. Her estimation of his character was on the whole correct; once more he wavered, and such was the alarm inspired by his hesitation, that Throckmorton advised Elizabeth to withhold all further help till it were known what he would do. His indecision was not, however, so great that it paralysed all action; he continued his march towards Dreux under the impression that 4000 English had left Hâvre to form a junction with him, and nothing

* Wright, "Elizabeth and Her Time," vol. i. p. 102.

appeared likely to intercept his progress. Nevertheless he had a dream, announcing, as he told Beza, that a struggle was imminent, and the next day the two armies having met suddenly, an engagement took place under the walls of Dreux. The Duke of Guise seized the command when the Constable of France was taken prisoner, and changed an almost certain defeat into a brilliant victory. "That night," says Chantonnay, "the Duke slept in the same bed with Condé, his prisoner, as if they had been the best friends in the world."* Even his adversaries could not but admire the chivalry and delicacy with which the conqueror treated the vanquished.†

The battle was fought on December 19, and on the 24th, the Duke wrote to Philip II. to express all that he owed to the courage of the Spanish troops placed at his disposal.

The Catholic army was victorious, but the prisoners of war were about equal on both sides, and if Elizabeth had been faithful even to her treachery, the odds would have been almost equally divided. But notwithstanding promises and treaties, added to Throckmorton's prayer to "scatter a little money," not one crown of the stipulated hundred thousand had been paid, and the Huguenots were in dire need of funds to carry on the war. It was this fact, as much as the actual victory, that strengthened the hands of the Catholics. Beza, who had been present at the battle of Dreux, had counselled the death of the chiefs of the Catholic army who had been taken prisoners, and Coligny had consented, provided that exception were made of the Constable, his uncle. The Marshal Saint André was murdered in cold blood.

When the defeat of the Huguenots became known, Throckmorton fled to Nogent-le-roi, and took refuge with the Duchess de Bouillon, who, however, gave him up the next day to the Duke of Guise. With his accustomed courtesy, the Duke made him dine with him in his tent, and in the course of dinner, he asked the ambassador what he thought of the battle. After chatting agreeably for some time, the Duke reminded him of his alliance with the insurgents of Orleans, and consulted him as one of the principal instigators of the

* Letter of the 21st of December, 1562. Belgian Archives.

† Theodore Beza, "The Story of the Campaign," book vi.

troubles, in the choice of remedies to be applied, inquiring whether Elizabeth would continue to set the bad example of abetting the king's subjects in their rebellion.

“ But does not Philip II. interfere also ? ” broke in Throckmorton.

“ Yes,” replied the Duke, “ but with this difference, that the King of Spain supports the king against the rebels, whereas Elizabeth supports the rebels against the king.”

The papers found upon Throckmorton compromised him so deeply, that seeing his share of the responsibility clearly established, he flung away the last vestige of his disguise.* There was no longer any pretence of neutrality on the part of the Queen of England, and the situation was perhaps unique—that of a country being at war with a sovereign whose ambassador was not recalled. And notwithstanding all, such was the generosity of the Duke of Guise, that Throckmorton was at once set at liberty.†

On receiving the news of the victory of Dreux, Catherine went with her son to Nôtre Dame to return thanks. The next day there was a solemn procession in honour of the event, but at the same time the Queen Mother charged her agent in London to protest to Elizabeth that the battle had been fought at the instigation of the Parisians, and in spite of her orders.‡ In keeping with her strange and vacillating policy throughout, Catherine's sole aim was even now to treat with the Huguenots and their allies. Elizabeth answered by offering to give up the places she occupied in Normandy in exchange for Calais. But at last some spark of justice and regard for the honour of France seemed to kindle in Catherine's bosom, and she began to realise that it was too much to concede in her hour of triumph what she had refused to give up throughout her reverses.

Hostilities were therefore resumed, and the Huguenots seeking to avert an attack which they had reason to fear, at once set fire to the arsenal of Paris, where a great quantity of powder was stored. Fifty houses were destroyed, and more than three hundred persons perished.

* Chautonnay, *Lettres Missives*. Belgian Archives.

† Forbes, vol. ii. p. 251.

‡ Letter from the Bishop of Aquila, December 27, 1562. Belgian Archives.

There was a rumour current that the Huguenots, when they were beaten, had recourse to assassination, and during the reign of Francis II., a popular prophecy had foretold that when the fortune of the Duke of Guise should be at its height, he would be struck down by a pistol shot.

Months before the blow was aimed, his death was decreed at an assembly held in the palace of the Elector Palatine at Heidelberg, the Duke of Würtemberg's being the only dissentient voice. Francis of Guise was to meet his death in the midst of his most brilliant achievements. On the day of his triumphal entry into Rouen, a Huguenot was discovered lurking in the camp. On being questioned, and seeing that all was lost, he admitted boldly that he had come there for the purpose of assassinating the Duke, from no personal enmity, but guided alone by zeal for his religion. His intended victim dismissed him with these noble words :

"If your religion teaches you to assassinate those who have never offended you, mine teaches me to forgive my enemies."*

After his triumph at Dreux, his death was publicly prayed for in the Huguenot conventicles. Preachers called down the vengeance of heaven upon him, and Theodore Beza appealed aloud to God to deliver France from him.

Condé, from his prison in the Château of Loches, charged his brother the Cardinal Bourbon to warn the Duke of Guise that his life was in danger, and so certain was he of his doom, that every morning for a fortnight he inquired of his guards whether the Duke were not killed or wounded.†

The honour of doing to death the Catholic champion was reserved for a young gentleman among the Huguenots named Poltrot, who was one day overheard by his chief the Vicomte d'Aubeterre, to express regret that the King of Navarre did not fall by his hand. The Vicomte, conceiving that he would be a useful instrument for the crime already decreed, sent him to his brother-in-law de Soubise at Lyons. De Soubise had at one time been prosecuted for mal-practices with the public money and had owed his escape from punishment to François de Guise. It was a reason the more with the fanatical Huguenot for getting rid of one whose very

* Dupleix, p. 655.

† Chautonnay, February 27 and March 2, 1563. Belgian Archives.

existence reminded him of his crime. He sent Poltrot to Coligny, who welcomed him with these words: "Monsieur de Soubise tells me that you desire greatly to serve religion; serve it well then."

It was the manner agreed upon for Coligny to make known to Poltrot that his offer was accepted, and he gave him some money. The "useful instrument" then went to the Duke of Guise and offered him his services, which were accepted. But Poltrot was not yet so hardened in crime as to be entirely proof against the courtesy and generosity with which the Duke treated him. Three times he begged of Coligny that he would release him from the terrible obligation he had incurred, and three times Coligny strengthened him in his resolve. The admiral at last sent him to Beza, who told him that he might act with an easy conscience, that angels would be present at the deed, and that if he did not succeed (passing on to the death which awaited failure) he would go straight to heaven.*

Poltrot then hastened to the Duke of Guise before Orleans, and after making a low bow, said that he had been seduced into following the Prince of Condé, but that now seeing the error of his ways he came with the firm purpose of serving the king faithfully for the rest of his life.

Surrounded by treachery on every side, the Duke had never learned to be on his guard against his enemies. Himself frank and loyal in the extreme, there was something child-like in his confidence that these qualities were not mere professions in others, and although he knew himself to be the object of supreme hatred among the whole Huguenot faction, he was lamentably incapable of suspecting individuals. He received Poltrot kindly and even affectionately, and invited him to his table, thereby nearly upsetting again the would-be assassin's newly infused principles. However, another visit to Beza, and a present of 100 crowns from Coligny to buy a horse, brought him finally to the "sticking point," and with the promise that if he succeeded in escaping, he was to be the richest man of his house, he resolved to go in and win.†

On February 18, 1563, at dusk, Poltrot, hidden behind a hedge, discharged three bullets into his victim's body. The wound

* *La Ferrière*, vol. i. p. 516.

† "Lettres d'Etienne Pasquier," liv. ch. xx.

was not deep, but the balls were poisoned. The murderer got away at once, on the horse bought with Coligny's gold, but having ridden all night, he found himself at dawn close to the camp he was flying from. Paralysed with fear, he hid himself in a peasant's hut, but the occupant remarking his confusion gave him up to some archers from the Royalist camp.* When questioned, he confessed that he had been moved to the crime by Beza's persuasion and Coligny's gold.†

Cecil's agent, Thomas Smith, also testified to the incentives. He wrote to Elizabeth on February 26, that de Soubise had first tempted Poltrot, and that Theodore Beza had completed his conquest.‡

The Duke's agony lasted for five days, during which he edified all who approached him by his resignation and unaffected piety. In touching terms he confessed aloud the sins of his past life, and without naming Coligny, whom all regarded as the chief author of his death, he said, "I forgive you who are the cause of my undoing." He breathed his last on February 24, and on March 20, his funeral honours were celebrated with great pomp in the cathedral of *Nôtre Dame* at Paris.

According to Thomas Smith, there was but one unanimous voice in the camp in praise of the Duke of Guise and in mourning for his untimely end. "He was," declared the writer, who will not be accused of partiality, "not only the greatest soldier in France, but in all Christendom. Inured to fatigue, of great military experience, courteous, eloquent and generous, he was beloved equally by officers and by the common soldiers."§

A terrible chastisement awaited the authors of the crime; the young Duke of Guise swore not to die till he had avenged his father's death. "A day will come," wrote the English agent, "when Coligny in his turn will be assassinated in expiation of the murder of the Duke of Guise." That day was the terrible feast of St. Bartholomew 1572. Coligny was at Caen with Throckmorton and Beza when the news was brought of the death of his greatest enemy. He expressed neither

* Chautonnay, February 23, 1563. Belgian Archives.

† *Ibid.* February 27, 1563. Belgian Archives.

‡ *Forbes*, vol. ii. p. 329.

§ *Ibid.*

regret nor emotion, and sent the message on at once to the Queen of England. Nevertheless when he heard that he was everywhere considered the author of the crime, he felt obliged to write to Catherine and justify himself. In this letter, he admitted that Poltrot had revealed his intention to him, and that he had given him money to buy a horse to enable him to escape, and instead of expressing regret for what had happened, he judged that it was the greatest blessing that could be. Etienne Pasquier observes that Coligny defended himself so coldly that his friends wished he had said nothing or had expressed himself better.* If it were true, as has been asserted, that Poltrot subsequently retracted his accusation of Coligny, there would have been no case at all against the Admiral, and he would not have been forced to make the damning admissions which have convicted him out of his own mouth. Condé discovered the only possible way to rehabilitate him, by declaring that the murder of the duke was a tactic of war, and did not come within the jurisdiction of a civil court.

The joy of the Huguenots was shared by the English. Throckmorton told Elizabeth that the death of the Duke of Guise would improve the state of affairs, and that it "would be useful to send the promised money." All Normandy, with the exception of Rouen, was in the hands of the English, and Catherine saw herself in the predicament of an English invasion on one side, and of a German on the other. At Orleans, the besieged appeared on the ramparts, dressed in strange garments and uttering wild cries, while they insulted by gestures the Catholic religion and the Royal family. Failing to obtain any satisfaction from Coligny, the Queen Regent again had recourse to Condé, and partly won over by her arguments, partly it is said influenced by the beauty and charm of a young lady by whom she was accompanied, he concluded a treaty of pacification with her. By this treaty, Protestants of noble family had the right to practise their religion in their own houses, and certain towns were named in which Huguenots of all classes might do the same. Thus peace was made with Condé, but with the other chiefs, an amnesty only was con-

* Pasquier, Book iv. letter 21.

cluded. When this news became known, the German army proceeded no further; but Elizabeth was furious. Condé had undertaken, if he got what he wanted, to rid France of the English, and with him had seceded the young King of Navarre and certain others. There was no limit to the strong language which poured from Elizabeth's lips. The former "Joshua of the people of God" was henceforth "a traitor, a perjurer, a miserable wretch." She went so far as to say that he was good for nothing but to be thrown to the dogs.*

Nevertheless, at the French Court he flourished in the first rank, and the enmity between the Queens of France and England was at last real and sincere. "I am an Englishwoman and the Queen of France is a Florentine," exclaimed Elizabeth in her wrath, "but it shall be seen which of us two shall outwit the other."†

Henceforth the war entered a new phase, retaining however its revolutionary character, and developing situations as novel as they were discreditable to the principal actors in the drama.

J. M. STONE.

* Stevenson, Cal. of State Papers, No. 753.

† Memoirs de Condé, ii. 160.

ART. VIII.—THE PRIMITIVE SAINTS AND THE SEE OF ROME.

A BOOK upon this subject has recently appeared which has its points of interest in the controversy between Anglicanism and the Catholic Church. There is a great deal of thoroughly good writing in it, and it has the merit of clearness and of keeping to the point. And the point which it endeavours to enforce is exactly that which ought to be kept in the forefront of the “Anglo-Roman” controversy. It addresses itself to the impossible task of proving that the Primitive Saints regarded the See of Rome as possessed of a primacy of honour, but nothing more, and of a primacy of natural growth, not of divine institution.

There was a marked primacy of honour and influence, but there was no primacy of jurisdiction. The inherent jurisdiction of the Roman See was exactly the same as the inherent jurisdiction of every other See in Christendom (p. 22).

The book is really a *rechauffé* of the arguments to be found in Gallican works, applied to the Anglican position, but no Gallican would have accepted Mr. Puller’s position. As regards a General Council, for instance, according to Mr. Puller’s theory, the confirmation of the Pope differs little, if at all, from its confirmation by any patriarch.

But there is a compactness about Mr. Puller’s book, and an elaborateness in detail, which is likely to make it a handbook for the Anglican clergy for some time to come. It is, moreover, introduced to the public by a preface from Bishop King, the defendant in the celebrated Lincoln case. And there are names mentioned in the author’s preface which show that the book may be rightly treated as an “Anglican manifesto.” And as such we propose to deal with a portion of its contents. Of course it will not be accepted by all who belong to the Church of England as a fair or thorough presentation of their position ; but it would be hard to find any treatise that would. Quite lately a remarkable little book, in its way, has appeared from another English clergyman, belonging to the same school

of thought, which completely contradicts Mr. Puller's most cherished contention. This writer says :

The Primacy is of our Lord's appointment, it resides in Rome, because Rome was chosen for St. Peter's fixed and final See. The evidence of this is overwhelming. The only passage that I know of, which can be quoted against it, is the clause in the abortive Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, that the Fathers gave the Primacy to Rome because it was the imperial city; but this sentence, even if the Canon were authoritative, which it is not, does not explain the Primacy, but only why Rome was chosen for its seat. I feel this is most important for anything like fair and respectful controversy with Rome.*

Mr. Puller thinks quite otherwise : his title contains his conviction on this point—it is the "See of Rome," not the "See of Peter." He is in diametrical opposition on this point to Archbishop Bramhall, whom he cites, nevertheless, as a representative "Anglican divine" (p. 367); for Bramhall said that "he must be either meanly versed in the primitive Fathers, or give little credit to them, who will deny the Pope to succeed St. Peter in the Roman bishopric."† Mr. Puller, on the other hand, speaks of this doctrine, when he meets with it in St. Cyprian, as a novel doctrine (p. 54) due to "the Clementine romance." And when he comes to that which is involved in the expression "See of Peter," as stated by Philip, the legate at Ephesus, he calls it a "new doctrine, new and therefore false" (p. 184).

Our readers will at once see from this that Mr. Puller's position is a step lower down than that which Dr. Pusey had reached, when he spoke of his willingness to accept some form of the "supremacy" of the Pope. Its position more resembles that of Dr. Littledale, only Mr. Puller is never offensive as that writer was. But his treatment of the Councils reveals the same tone of mind that betrayed itself in those two writers. He picks his own way amidst the maze of Patristic writings, owning no authority as his guide. This is a necessary result of his position. For instance, when he deals with the question of heretical baptism, he informs us that the Church of England, though it has its custom, differs from the Catholic, or, as he

* "Leadership, not Lordship," p. 49. By Rev. A. C. Hall. C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1892.

† Works, vol. ii. p. 373.

would call it, the Roman, Church in leaving the matter (even at this time in the Church's history) an open question : "The controversy has never been decided by an authority which binds the whole Church" (p. 73). St. Augustine expressly says that it has ; but Mr. Puller ventures to differ from St. Augustine. He differs also from the entire body of bishops (nearly all Eastern) who were engaged at Ephesus in asserting the Catholic faith as to the doctrine of the Incarnation. These all agreed that the teaching which Mr. Puller condemns as "new and therefore false doctrine" (p. 184), was neither new nor false. In fact, they agreed that it was history itself. Philip said that "it is doubtful to no one, but rather has been known to all ages" (*i.e.*, not only is it an acknowledged tenet throughout the Church now, but it is the verdict of the Primitive Saints)—

that the holy and most blessed Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, and pillar of the faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church, received of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the kingdom, and power was given to him to bind and loose sins ; who up to this time and always lives and exercises judgment in his successors.

This was not a remark that was allowed to die away in silence. The other legates based their decision on the same grounds, and St. Cyril rose to say that the assembly had "heard what the legates had said," and the whole Council in agreeing to the condemnation of Nestorius expressly says—

since Arcadius and Projectus, the reverend and pious bishops and legates, and Philip, presbyter and legate of the Apostolic See, have spoken what is suitable, they ought to confirm the Acts by their signature.

Now, Mr. Puller differs from St. Cyril and this great body of Eastern bishops in calling Philip's words "an attempt to give a religious sanction to the great position which the Roman pontiffs had acquired mainly through the legislative action of the State" (p. 184). Indeed, his book may be considered as an attempt to reverse the account of the Church's history given at the Council of Ephesus.

Now what is Mr. Puller's explanation of the undoubted fact that the See of Rome came so early to be called by the saints, St. Cyprian amongst others, the See of Peter ? It has always

been considered to have been founded by the Apostles Peter and Paul, but how did it come to be called the See of Peter? To this day Papal Bulls are issued, in the name of the two Apostles, a fact which Bishop King seems to have ignored in his preface (p. xxi.); but how is it that the See has come to be universally recognised as the See of Peter? Mr. Puller thinks it sufficient to say that it was due to the "baleful influence" of the Clementine romance, in which St. Peter is seen placing Clement "in his own chair." His explanation, then, is as follows:

A romance found its way to Rome in the latter part of the second century. Up to that time the See of Rome had never been called the See of Peter, but only a See founded by the twin Apostles Peter and Paul. Then Rome, on the appearance of this book, chose to forget her past history, and in spite of the perpetual confluence of strangers to Rome, through whom, according to Mr. Puller's impossible interpretation of Irenæus' words, the faith was kept secure at Rome, in that very century—Rome, the very scene of the ordination of St. Clement—Rome, the orthodox—Rome, whose virtues, according to Bishop Lightfoot, gained for her a primacy of honour—Rome suddenly took up with a falsehood which enhanced her own importance, and persuaded others to adopt the same, and gave out that the account in the "Clementine romance" was the true one, and that her See was the See of Peter! The Primitive Saints, Eastern and Western, African included, were taken in, and Christendom got into the way of calling Rome the See of Peter! *Credat Judæus Apella.*

Now, where we think Mr. Puller's theories conspicuously fail, is in a certain lack of reverence for the judgment of the Primitive Saints as a whole. A single swallow does not make a summer; and an exceptional incident in a saint's life, or an exceptional scene in the Church's history, is not a sufficient foundation for the tremendous edifice which he builds upon it. He does not appreciate the supernatural vigour of the Church's constitution, which will repel a foreign element with greater certainty than he seems to suppose. A doctrine, for such it is, like that of the See of Rome being the See of Peter, could not have sunk down into the heart of Christendom to the extent that it did, if it had been untrue.

But even in the case of individual saints, Mr. Puller seems to us to fail in appreciating the crucial point of their evidence.

One of the *pièces de résistance* in this book is the supposition that Meletius was out of communion with the See of Rome, *in the sense* in which Cardinal Wiseman used the expression "communion," when he said (as quoted by Mr. Puller, p. 220) :

According to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, it is easy at once to ascertain who are the Church Catholic, and who are in a state of schism, by simply discovering who are in communion with the See of Rome, and who are not.

But there is one point in the evidence in favour of Meletius having been in communion with Rome and having always considered it a matter of importance to be in communion with her, which Mr. Puller does not so much as mention. And yet to us it seems of greater weight than all the evidence on the other side which Mr. Puller has so laboriously accumulated—we mean the fact that *Meletius himself claimed to be in communion with Rome*.

St. Jerome, in a subsequent letter* to one with which Mr. Puller deals most trenchantly, pitying the saint because of his youthful perplexity, states that as a matter of fact all the three bishops claimed to be in communion with Rome.

The ancient authority of the monks, who dwell around rises up upon me. I meanwhile exclaim, if any one be joined to the chair of Peter, he is mine. Meletius, Vitalis, and Paulinus, say that they adhere to you; if only one of them asserted this, I could believe him.

Now it is impossible to suppose that Mr. Puller never read this important letter; we must therefore suppose that he deliberately ignored it. He did not feel its weight. And it is precisely in this kind of argument that Mr. Puller fails. His treatment of St. Jerome's witness is altogether unworthy of a serious writer. We know the life of prayer and mortification and study of Holy Scripture St. Jerome was leading, and how familiar he must have been with the teaching of East and West. The few years that he had been a Christian

* Ep. xvi.

were not too few for him to know what the general teaching of the Church was; but his account of it was completely subversive of Mr. Puller's thesis; and Mr. Puller brushes his witness aside on the ground that he was young (he was thirty), and annoyed by the divisions of the East, and naturally attracted by the admitted orthodoxy of Rome. Mr. Puller thinks it enough to say that "all the glorious Eastern saints of that age" (p. 171) were on the side of Meletius. But in what sense were they on his side? If St. Jerome's facts be true, St. Basil was holding communion with one who could assure him that he was in communion with Rome. For St. Jerome states that Meletius claimed communion with Rome, so that he was not guilty of the formal heresy of denying the necessity of being in some sort of communion with the See of St. Peter, at least in intention. St. Jerome makes many a mistake in his history; but it is hardly possible to suppose that he is mistaken in his facts here. It was the very point of his perplexity that Meletius claimed communion with the chair of Peter. He was mistaken, indeed, in supposing that St. Meletius and Paulinus could not both be in communion with Rome at the same time. But the one is the statement of a matter of fact, of which he was bound to be cognisant—viz., that Meletius made the claim to communion with Rome; the other had to do with the method of government which obtained at Rome, and which, judging from the Council of Alexandria (362), was probably due to the influence of St. Athanasius, and on this St. Jerome might easily be mistaken.

Now, if Meletius claimed communion with Rome, we may be sure that he enjoyed it. But this is just one of those pieces of evidence of which Mr. Puller does not seem to see the force.

There is another feature of this book which seriously detracts from its value. Mr. Puller regrets in his preface that he "has been unable to discuss the history of the Roman pontificate in relation to the four great heresies connected with the names of Arius, Pelagius, Nestorius, and Eutyches" (p. xxvii.). Of course a writer cannot be expected to deal with everything in the course of a book of 407 pages. But we are bound to say that Mr. Puller occasionally shows signs of an entire non-recognition of the filling-up, or background, of the

Church's life, in which instances of supposed or actual withdrawal of communion with the See of St. Peter occur. His title, therefore, raises in us expectations which his book does not fulfil. The Primitive Saints, amongst whom Mr. Puller must reckon many of the Popes themselves, although he seems most unwilling to believe their word, can hardly be dealt with satisfactorily if we exclude the struggle of the Church against the four great heresies that depraved the doctrine of the Incarnation. But Mr. Puller most seriously misrepresents the evidence of the Councils, so far as he does deal with them.

For instance, he makes the strangest statement about the relation of the Holy See to the Council of Ephesus.

He says that St. Cyril "took precedence of the legates who represented Celestine in the Council." He is endeavouring to prove that at the Council of Chalcedon, "for the first time in the history of the Church, the legates of the Pope presided at an Ecumenical Council" (p. 268). And in order to prove this, he reminds his readers that St. Cyril presided at Ephesus, sitting above "the legates who represented Celestine." "This," he adds, "was quite in accordance with the Church's ancient custom." It is difficult to make out what exactly Mr. Puller considers to be the Church's ancient custom on this point. St. Cyril was not Bishop of Ephesus, where the Council sat, nor was he the senior bishop in point of age, neither was he appointed by the Emperor. But as a matter of fact, Mr. Puller has ignored the plain testimony of the Acts of the Council. It is distinctly stated that St. Cyril sat where he did *as occupying the place of the Pope*. That there may be no mistake about this, we will quote the words themselves. In the first Act the words are, "Cyril of Alexandria, who also occupied the place of Celestine, the most holy and sacred archbishop of the Roman Church."* In the second, the words are, "Cyril, the Alexandrine, who also occupied the place of the most holy and blessed archbishop of the Church of the Romans."† In the third, Cyril of Alexandria, "who also occupied the place of the most holy and most blessed Celestine, archbishop of the Roman Church."‡ In the fourth, "Cyril, the Alexandrine, who also occupied the place of Celestine, the

* Mansi, t. iv. p. 1123.

+ *Ibid.* p. 1292.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 1306.

most holy archbishop of the Roman Church." In the fifth Act, the legates from Rome presided and not Cyril, for Cyril and Memnon pleaded their own cause in that session. In the sixth it is again Cyril, "who also occupied the place of Celestine, the most holy archbishop of the Church of the Romans;" and in a very old codex in Paris it runs, "Cyril of Alexandria, acting also as Vicar (*agente etiam vicem*) of the most holy and religious prelate of the Roman Church, Celestine."*

It is, therefore, not candid to say that St. Cyril took precedence of the legates who represented Celestine in the Council, without adding that he did so *as the representative of the Pope*, from which Mr. Puller's argument gains nothing, or rather is overthrown.

Mr. Puller does deal with the Council of Nice, and his treatment of the history of that Council is a good instance of the way in which he manipulates his authorities, and it also contains a sample of a kind of argument which we often meet with in Anglican writers. We will, therefore, deal with both his authorities and his argument against Papal infallibility.†

"If St. Silvester was the infallible monarch of the Church, and was so recognised, his sovereign position ought to come out clearly in the history of the Council" (p. 144).

Now here is another instance of the way in which Mr. Puller often ignores the background in which the incidents he selects, really occurred.

There was no reason why the infallibility of the Holy See should appear in the definition or the Canons of the Council, and *we do not possess the Acts*. Indeed, there is no reason why the infallibility of the Holy See should appear in the Acts, even if we did possess them. For what is that infallibility? It is the security of Divine assistance *when* the Holy Father is led to define a matter of faith or morality as obligatory on the whole Church. Who can say when the Holy See will be led to use this form of teaching? When Mr. Puller says, "The decision of the Council was enforced on the Arian heretics without anybody waiting to find out whether the Pope agreed

* Mansi, t. iv. p. 1342.

† Mr. Puller says (p. xxvii.) that he has not thought it necessary to "devote any lecture to the consideration of the crowning claim of the Papacy to doctrinal infallibility," but he occasionally deals with the subject.

or disagreed with what had been done" (p. 144), he seems to forget that the very idea of the Council was to enforce in the East what was already the settled and known faith of the West. Does Mr. Puller suppose that any one in his senses would have dreamt of asking the Pope whether he accepted the "Homoousion?" Why, St. Athanasius pressed upon the Arians the fact that the history of the Pope Dionysius, in the preceding century, was sufficient to prove that their heresy had been "anathematised by all, long ago." St. Dionysius had enforced it on his namesake of Alexandria, or rather had heard the appeal of the Alexandrian suffragans, and cleared the Bishop of Alexandria from their accusation. The Arians were in the position of Anglicans. The judgment had been given, but they were not prepared to obey. They appealed to history; they said it was novel teaching; and St. Athanasius showed them their mistake.

What was the Pope St. Sylvester to do? Hold another Council in the West and issue an *ex cathedra* judgment? But another way was open, which had not yet been tried. Hosius' mission to Alexandria had failed, and his mission was to bring the malcontents into line with the teaching of Rome and Alexander, the Bishop of Alexandria. But in the providence of God the Emperor Constantine now occupied himself with the eastern portion of his empire. He had seen the unity of the West on this question. He found the East torn with dissension. He resolved that the faith of the West should prevail in the East. It was to be effected not by an Imperial edict, enforcing the faith as held at Rome, but by a Council. Had Pope St. Sylvester anything to do with convoking this Council? Mr. Puller says, "It was convoked by the Emperor, and there is no particle of proof that he consulted St. Sylvester before doing so" (p. 143). One is amazed at such assurance, and still more at the proof of the assertion offered by Mr. Puller. For he goes on to say that "Nobody attributed any share in the convocation of the Council to the Pope until the end of the seventh century." And with this terse dogmatic assurance he would leave his readers convinced that there is "no particle of proof" that the Emperor "consulted St. Sylvester" before summoning the Council. Mr. Puller has ignored the statement of the Legates at Chalcedon, that Dioscorus "had

ventured to arrange a Synod without leave from the Apostolic See" (by which is evidently meant that he had assumed the presidency without leave from the Pope)—“a thing which had never been done, and ought never to be done.”* Mr. Puller could hardly reply that that was only what Papal legates say, considering the reception with which this statement met from the bishops, *not one of whom challenged the position.*

But even if in deference to Mr. Puller's idea of candour, which seems to be that no one's statement is to be pressed if it consists in “magnifying his office,” although its evident acceptance by others interested in denying it, ought to go for something—even, we say, if we consent to forego the witness thus given at Chalcedon to the law of the Church, that the president of an Ecumenical Synod must rest with the Pope; still, who were they who made the statement to which Mr. Puller alludes with such vagueness? Who were they who, according to him, did attribute a share in the convocation of the Council of Nicaea to St. Sylvester? *They were Eastern bishops in a General Council.* They were Eastern bishops at a time when considerable rivalry had grown up between the East and West, and when pretensions to supremacy were severely sifted. Is it quite “candid” merely to allude to their witness without saying whose it was? So the bishops of the Ecumenical Synod of 680 did attribute to St. Sylvester a share in the convocation of the Nicene Council, and this is called “no particle of proof.”

But this is not all. Rufinus, quite a trustworthy writer, who was born close to the date of the Council, and who wrote about the end of the same century, says that Constantine convoked the Council “ex sacerdotum sententia.” It was not then the Emperor's idea alone, perhaps not even originally. Who were the priests who thought the Council ought to be called? It was not likely to be the suggestion of Eusebius and the rest of the Arianising Bishops, who surrounded the Court. They would have been the last to suggest it, or to look favourably on it. It was doubtless the advice of the Western Bishops, headed by the Pope, and the Bishop of

* Marinus' presidency at Arles is not to the point. It was not an Ecumenical Synod. The reason, too, which the Ballerini give should be noticed—viz. “sola loci ratio in causâ esse potuit.”

Alexandria. It was thus, in a very true sense, convoked with the advice of St. Sylvester, as the Eastern Bishops of the sixth General Council state. We know that letters were passing between Rome and Alexandria on the general crisis, and we may fairly assume that the subject of a Council would be amongst the topics of their correspondence.

Mr. Puller, moreover, maintains that "there is no reason to suppose that St. Sylvester presided in the Council, either personally or by his legates." No one ever supposed that he presided personally. But that he presided by his legates seems as clear as it could well be made by the very scanty records which we possess of the acts of this particular Council. Mr. Puller quotes Eusebius' account, but gives a turn to its obvious meaning. Eusebius says that the aged Pope was not there, but his legates were, and they filled his place. He is not speaking of the presidency, but merely gives a list of the bishops, and therefore remarks that his place was filled by his legates from Rome. What his place was is not stated, but certainly Eusebius' account does not exclude the fact that Hosius acted with his legates, as also representing the Pope. Hosius signed with the two legates straight from Rome, before the Bishop of Alexandria. The whole after-history of the Church contradicts Mr. Puller's idea that the Emperor could have placed a Western Bishop over all the great Eastern Sees, Alexandria included, merely on his own good pleasure, without the express consent of Sylvester, and not as representing the first See of Christendom. *Cordova, Rome, Alexandria!* this the order by the Emperor's decision! Is it conceivable that the legates at Chalcedon could propose that Dioscorus should be turned out of his place because he had ventured to arrange a Synod without the leave of the Pope, and that no Eastern Bishop should have arisen to say that a Western Bishop had taken precedence of all the Eastern Sees at Nicæa by command of the Emperor, whose permission Dioscorus also had?

Mr. Puller says that "some Ultramontanes suppose that he presided as the chief legate of the Pope." Does Mr. Puller rank St. Francois de Sales amongst the Ultramontanes? Does he nickname Bishop Hefele an Ultramontane? Surely Bishop Hefele's full and scholarly treatment of this question deserves something better than to be shelved after this cavalier fashion.

Mr. Puller proceeds: "but none of the early historians speak of him as holding any such position." Why, they none of them give the President at all. Eusebius unfortunately, from his Arian propensities, indulges in a description of the Council, but does not give us just the points we should have valued most, whilst Socrates only copies out Ensebius' words, and Sozomen, also omitting to mention the President, about whom probably no one doubted, makes a slip about the name of the Pope (Julius for Sylvester), and Theodoret, without giving the name of the President, says that the two presbyters had power given them to assent to what was done. And these are the historians that Mr. Puller adduces. Clearly their silence is of no account as an item in the evidence. Gelasius, of Cyzicus, does bracket Hosius with the two other legates. But Mr. Puller recognises no weight in his authority. But it will not quite do to set aside Gelasius in this summary way. He does not in this case give the legatine character of Hosius' presidency as a report, or a conclusion of his own, but he gives two lists of the signatures, which there is no fair ground for doubting. Most people, seeing that in the first few Sees the order of rank invariably observed in the Church, is preserved, would conclude that Hosius, being a *Western Bishop*, signed with the two legates above Alexandria, because he represented the first See in Christendom, and there are lists which expressly state this, and which are given by Gelasius.

But there is another singular witness to the fact that St. Sylvester was considered to have presided over the Council, one that ought to weigh considerably with Mr. Puller and his co-religionists, and that is, the Graeco-Russian Liturgy. In the office for St. Sylvester's day occurs the following address to him in reference to the Council of Nicæa: "Thou hast shown thyself the supreme one of the Sacred Council, O initiator into the sacred mysteries, and hast illustrated the throne of the supreme one of the disciples." Here is the Presidency of the Council attributed, as an established fact, to St. Sylvester, and it is connected with the traditional belief as to the supremacy of St. Peter amongst the Apostles. Photius, too, whom Mr. Puller calls the most learned prelate that ever sat on the throne of Constantinople, before his schism, followed

Gelasius in joining Hosius and the two priests together, as the Papal legation.

In connection with the Council of Nicæa, there is one question which figures very prominently in the preface to Mr. Puller's book by the Bishop of Lincoln, and being based on a statement by Canon Bright, from whom Bishop King quotes, it may be considered to be a prominent and general line of thought amongst the Anglicans. And Mr. Puller is emphatic on the subject. It is as follows:—

The sixth Canon, it is said (though this will have to be questioned), contains nothing about "any general powers belonging to Rome as the court of appeal for the whole Catholic Church," and Mr. Puller considers its silence "significant" (p. 147).

Undoubtedly, if the idea had been presented to the Synod, and if any claim on behalf of the Pope had been urged as a matter of divine right, *there can be no question* that a repudiation of such claim would have been made in *unmistakable* terms. But as a matter of fact the claim was not made, and therefore the whole conception which underlies the Vatican decrees was ignored. [The italics are our own.]

Bishop King, whilst not so dogmatic, is not less explicit.

Could the Fathers of the Council of Nicæa have passed the canons which we know they passed if they had recognised the Papal supremacy? We need bring our minds to the consideration of such words as Dr. Bright has given us in his notes on the sixth Canon of Nicæa: "The omission (of a saving clause acknowledging the unique and sovereign position of the Bishop of Rome) is a proof, if proof were wanted, that the First Ecumenical Council knows nothing of the doctrine of Papal supremacy" (Preface, by Bishop of Lincoln, p. xvi.).

This crowning "proof" is only another instance of what we have already noticed—viz., the lack of realising the circumstances under which Mr. Puller's selected incidents occur.

Now, be it remembered, the argument is, that if Papal infallibility be true, or if even the sovereign jurisdiction of the Holy See had been recognised at large, it must have been discussed, and its method of exercise settled, at the Council of Nicæa. One would have thought it enough to state the proposition to see its temerarious nature. Was then the Council of Nice assembled for the purpose of discussing everything? Is it conceivable that, given the truth of the sovereign jurisdic-

tion of the Holy See, the Holy Father would send delegates to a Council to discuss the truth? Had it ever been doubted? "The idea had," says Mr. Puller, "not crossed the minds of the Saints and Fathers who composed the Council." He derives a proof from the 5th Canon. Because that Canon provides that persons unjustly excommunicated by their bishop are referred to their Provincial Synod, Mr. Puller argues that the Fathers could not have dreamt of any appeal beyond that. Why, they were themselves engaged in settling a matter in which the Province had done its best, and were acting as a higher Court of Appeal. But it was no part of their business to settle in that Canon, what would happen if the Provincial Synod did not satisfy those who appeal from their Bishop to it. Does Mr. Puller suppose that appeals from a Patriarch to Rome were unknown? He must have forgotten the affair of Dionysius of Alexandria. The argument from silence needs very careful handling, and it is a plain abuse of it to argue that because a Canon settles that excommunicated persons are to appeal from their bishop to the Provincial Synod, they may not go beyond. The 5th Canon settled the machinery so far, and no farther. There was no call, it may be, to go further in their discussion.

But when Mr. Puller comes to the 6th Canon, he asks a question which contains a gratuitous assumption. He says,

Is it not marvellous that on the very first occasion when the whole Church has an opportunity of meeting together by representation in an *Ecumenical Synod*, the one matter in which it seems to *take no interest* is the divinely given prerogatives of its head. [The italics are again our own.]

It is surely the very reverse of marvellous, that if those prerogatives were divinely given, there should be no dispute about them. And the Western Bishops were not there. Why in the world should they enter on a question which was not one of those set down for discussion, and which it would have been grossly unfair to spring upon the Council in the absence of the Westerns? According to one account, there was an attempt to engage in philosophical discussions touching some fundamental verities, but without success. If this were so, it would not be from lack of interest, but because they had met for something else. They had met to consider the borderland

of Alexandria's jurisdiction for one thing, but it was not necessary that the question of the relation of the Holy See to the rest of the Church should be introduced on the top of that. It used to be the test of every "faithful" sermon in the Church of England, that it brought in the whole scheme of Redemption in the compass of thirty pages, and when some English clergymen began to deal with one point at a time, there was an objection raised that they were not "faithful" preachers, because they stuck to the point before them, and did not give "the whole Gospel" into the bargain. The objection raised by Bishop King, Canon Bright, and Mr. Puller, is of a similar order. If the sovereign jurisdiction of the Holy See was an undisputed truth, then it would have been quite out of place to drag it into a short Canon like the 5th; nor would it have been necessary to introduce it in the 6th. The Fathers addressed themselves to the point at issue, and did not stray beyond it. That point involved the limits of jurisdiction which belonged to certain Eastern Sees, and they did not enter upon the question of Western affairs.

Whilst, however, no argument can be derived from the fact, if it be such, that after dealing with the subject of the Consubstantiality of the Son, and settling in their Canons certain matters under actual discussion at the time, they did not enter on other questions, we cannot refrain from saying that neither Canon Bright nor any one else has proved that the 6th Canon did not *imply* the sovereign jurisdiction of the Pope, or that the form of the Canon read by Paschasinus at Chalcedon was spurious. Nor is it absolutely certain that we have the full original of the 6th Canon fully represented in any one of the copies which we at present possess.

This, however, is too long a subject to enter upon now. We will only say here that the Bishops at Chalcedon did not treat Paschasinus' version of the 6th Canon of Nicaea containing the words, "The Roman Church always held the Primacy," as spurious. The Archdeacon Aetius did not read his version of the Canon by way of showing that Paschasinus' version was spurious, for the Commissioners *had said before* that each should read the Canons on which they relied. The Roman Legate naturally read the Canon on which he relied first; and Aetius probably read only the 3rd Canon of Constantinople,

which alone bore upon the question before them.* But in summing up the whole discussion, the Imperial Commissioners said that what came out of it was that the primacy (using the very word in Paschasius' version which implies more than mere honour) is reserved for Rome. He then goes on to the real question before the Bishops, which had to do, not with Rome's position, but with the relative position of Alexandria and Constantinople. So that, if the accounts of the sixth Nicene Canon were compared for the sake of seeing which was true, it emerges that the comparison led to the declaration that the Roman version was true. As a matter of fact, no comparison was made, and the question of Rome's supremacy was left where it was before. It is a matter for serious protest that Bishop King should help to spread such an unhistorical rendering of the scene at Chalcedon, relying it would seem on the account of another.

As regards the whole question of the recognition of the Primacy of Rome, at Nicaea, we have St. Cyril of Alexandria's statement that the Nicene Fathers decreed with reference to the Paschal controversy that the Church of Alexandria should make the due calculations for the proper day of its observance, and notify it to the Roman Church every year, "whence the universal Church through the whole world might know *by Apostolic authority* the day fixed for the Paschal Feast."

It would be difficult to imagine a more thorough recognition of the central position of Rome. The churches throughout the world were not to receive the notice from Alexandria: there would be a lack of Apostolic authority about such a notification; they would receive it from Rome, and so by "Apostolic authority." There can be no question what St. Cyril understood by "Apostolic authority." Rome was to him "the Apostolic See."

Mr. Puller is equally unreliable when he proceeds to deal with the Popes of the fourth century. He appears anxious to meet the difficulty which an Anglican must feel, in studying the fourth and fifth centuries, about the plain assertions made by the Popes before a Christian public, as to the responsibilities of their office. He accordingly does his

* The writer of this article has dealt with this question somewhat fully in the book which he is allowed to announce as about to appear in the autumn.

best to show that the Christian world generally had gone so far astray, Popes included, that such a thing was possible as a revolution in the thoughts of Western Christianity as to the source of the position occupied by the Bishop of Rome. We hope we are not doing Mr. Puller an injustice in thus orientating the ideas he has expressed in his lecture on the Papacy in the fourth century. We at any rate can only do justice to our own estimate of that chapter by characterising his treatment of some holy men as nothing short of brutal. Take, for instance, his treatment of Liberius. The history of Liberius is just one of those matters on which modern scholarship has done so much, that a mere reference to Baronius (that Cuvier of ecclesiastical annalism, to whom it was given to lift the whole subject and roll it on a new level) betrays a superficial grasp of the subject. Mr. Puller quotes a saying of Baronius on the return of Liberius from exile (p. 139), as that of one "whose opinion may safely be accepted in such a matter." Baronius calls it a conjecture, and makes it with a sort of apology. And he proceeds to ground his conjecture on a letter of Liberius, which is now generally admitted by scholars to be a forgery. Can there be the slightest doubt that Baronius would have hailed this discovery of modern scholarship and have been only too glad to attribute Liberius' action to a higher motive? We are not speaking of the vexed question as to Liberius having signed some document while in exile, but of the supposed motives which led him to seek his release, which Mr. Puller greedily adopts from Baronius on the ground of a forgery.

But, worse still, Mr. Puller makes the extraordinary statement that because Ammianus Marcellinus attributes the *fracas*, which attended the election of St. Damasus to the pontifical throne, to the splendid position of the Bishop of Rome at that time, therefore the said writer "implies that Liberius must have *sanctioned and used the grandeur and luxury*" attributed by this heathen historian to the Roman bishop. The pagan historian is, indeed, about as much to be trusted on such a matter, as a member of the Liberation Society in his tirades against the Archbishop of Canterbury and his fifteen thousand a year. The establishment of the Christian religion at Rome had necessarily led to a tremendous revolution in men's

thoughts as to the Christian Church and to a vast amount of general worldliness. But there is not an iota of proof that either Liberius or Damasus were in any way responsible for the state of things, or that they were lacking in personal self-discipline. It is simply inconceivable that Liberius, at any rate, should have impressed himself on the orthodox world as he did, if he had been what the baseless and brutal suggestions of Mr. Puller would paint him. He has not adduced one substantiated fact to prove his point. It was a necessary part of his thesis to show that the Popes of the fourth century were not what the Christian world has hitherto held them to be; for if they were good men, Mr. Puller has too much sympathy with goodness to suppose that they would inaugurate (as in Mr. Puller's theory they did) a vile scheme of ambition which revolutionised the government of the Church. Mr. Puller has done his best to paint them black, but has he succeeded? Is it certain that even the one passage which he quotes from St. Basil, omitting another which shows that that saint was rather impatient for St. Damasus' intervention in the affairs of the East—is it, we say, certain that he meant any depreciation of St. Damasus' character, instead of merely an allusion to the universal difficulty of getting people in high life to attend to everybody's wants? But as for Liberius' moral character, which Mr. Puller does not spare, how does he account for the verdict passed on him by the Primitive Saints themselves? He was, according to St. Basil, "the most blessed Bishop Liberius;" according to St. Epiphanius, "the Pontiff of blessed memory;" according to St. Ambrose, "the thrice holy Bishop;" according to the Greek historian Theodoret, "the illustrious athlete for the faith;" according to Cassiodorus, "the great Liberius, the most holy Liberius." He is, in the menology of the Greeks, a saint distinguished as "the blessed Liberius, defender of the truth," "whose zeal for the orthodox faith caused him to undertake the defence of the great Athanasius." His exile is there related, and his return, but not a whisper of any defection, the account ending with saying that "he died at Rome, after having governed his flock well." But, according to Mr. Puller, "it cannot be said that, taken as a whole, his pontificate was worthy of the exalted position which he occupied" (p. 140)—a bold attempt to

reverse the verdict of the Primitive Saints on the high character of a Pope, to whom the Christian world is so deeply indebted.

Let us now turn to St. Basil and his friendship for his friend St. Meletius, of Antioch. Mr. Puller (p. 240) quotes a passage from St. Basil's 214th letter in which he considers that the saint "clearly lays down that the papal decision is not decisive on the question of orthodoxy." We are not quite sure what is included in the phrase, "the papal decision"—whether it means "any" papal decision, or the final authoritative decision; and, again, whether the question of orthodoxy means the question of a person's orthodoxy which had not been submitted to a process of investigation, or the question of what is the right faith. For the purposes of Mr. Puller's book it ought to mean the final decision on a person whose case has been thoroughly investigated. But it will be best to see what St. Basil meant.

Now St. Basil in this letter is dealing with a report that the Bishop of Rome had committed the See of Antioch to a person whom St. Basil held to be unorthodox, in preference to Meletius. He does not say that the Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction in that region—*i.e.*, over the principal See of the East. Much less does he hold that they are schismatics who hold with Paulinus, to whom the commendatory letters from Rome were said to be addressed. It is astonishing that Mr. Puller should go the length of asserting this. St. Basil speaks of Paulinus and his followers as "of the household of faith," and he congratulates them on receiving letters from Rome—letters, too, which he says entrusted the Church of Antioch to their charge. The expression cuts at the root of Mr. Puller's theory of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, so far as St. Basil's witness is concerned.

But these men seem to have been stretching the verdict contained in the "letters from Rome" to a conclusion which they did not warrant. And St. Basil deprecates this. He says that he is not disposed "on that account" (*i.e.*, on account of Paulinus' party having received favourable letters from Rome) "to ignore Meletius, or to have the Church under him forgotten." And he calls Meletius "that admirable Bishop of the true Church of God." He is not, as Mr. Puller interprets, contrasting the truth of Paulinus' Church, so to speak,

with the “Church under Meletius,” but merely asserting that the party of Meletius is a part of the Church. In this Rome agreed with St. Basil, and possibly St. Basil knew this. But by way of defining his position, St. Basil goes on to say that in case he were asked by any authority on earth or in heaven, Pope or angel, to communicate with a person whom he knew to be unsound in the faith, he should decline to do so.

For it is not only that, if any one having received a letter of men were to pride himself on it, I should not allow myself to withdraw [from the position I have taken up]; but even if one should have come from heaven itself, but should not walk by the health-giving word of the faith, I am not able to consider him as partaker in the holy mysteries.

St. Basil had entreated Rome to issue a commission to investigate the matter on the spot. For some reason Rome had not consented to do this, but she had received a report from Eusebius of Vercelli. This trusted prelate, when at Antioch, had suspended his judgment. He appears to have disapproved of Lucifer's precipitate action in ordaining Paulinus, but, whilst deprecating, he did not feel justified in disowning it. Lucifer had acted under the impression that Meletius could not right himself with the orthodox after having coquetted with semi-Arianism. But he did not know the man, and how nobly he could atone for his mistake. Eusebius, however, would not so far condemn the action of his co-legate Lucifer as to communicate with Meletius. After his report to Rome, the Pope seems to have thought it was a matter that had better be left to work itself out,* and whilst declaring himself in favour of the bishop (Paulinus) ordained by his legate, and deciding to commit the See to him, he yet left Meletius in possession of his followers, whom St. Basil correctly calls “the Church under Meletius,” which was thus allowed to be a part of the “true Church of God.” It was an anomalous state of things, and not one from which a writer is justified in arguing in favour of the theory that communion with the See of Rome was a matter of indifference. Clearly St. Basil did not think that. He congratulated the followers of Paulinus on receiving letters from Rome, but decided to adhere to Meletius, who was a kind of master to him and

* Eusebius declared the matter “well nigh incurable.” Theod. iii. 5.

his choicest friend. In the letter of which Mr. Puller makes so much, St. Basil enunciated a principle, perfectly sound according to the teaching of the Vatican decrees, that in a case in which the *faith was known and settled*, and in which a person was contravening it, no authority could dictate to him his course of action under pain of mortal sin. The case, as put by St. Basil, had not the remotest reference to the dogma of Papal Infallibility, and it was not one in which the exercise of papal jurisdiction was necessarily right. Mr. Puller thinks he has made a point against the Vatican decrees, when he can show that St. Basil held there were cases in which no man nor angel had authority to compel his obedience. But this only shows that Mr. Puller has not grasped the teaching of the Vatican Council. It is, indeed, the great flaw of the whole book that Mr. Puller has before him a view of "communion" which is not that which Cardinal Wiseman, whom he opposes, had before him, and that Mr. Puller's idea of papal jurisdiction seems to be that of an absolute, unconditional monarchy;* whereas, according to the Vatican decrees, it has its limits. Mr. Puller refuses to deal with those decrees as he would with a legal document, giving to the terms their proper technical value. Those decrees were for the Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church has her existing theology, which explains the terms used. They took their place, by the good pleasure of the Holy Ghost, in the midst of a system of teaching into which they fit, and from which the value of the terms are to be discovered.

But in this particular case, Mr. Puller has also given a colouring to St. Basil's words which heightens the supposed contradiction between them and his theory of papal jurisdiction.† He has inserted the words "such a letter," which is possibly the meaning; but he has also carried the word "letter" on as the subject of the following clause of the sentence. Now the word he has translated "agree with,"‡ is never applied to things, but to persons. It is twice used in the Epistle to the Galatians, to which St. Basil is obviously

* So Bramhall, "an absolute ecclesiastical monarchy." Works, vol. ii. p. 372.

† P. 239, line 12: "If such a letter should not agree with the sound word of faith."

‡ $\sigmaτοιχή$.

referring when he speaks of some one coming from heaven. And in both cases the word is used of *persons walking* according to the spirit (v. 25) and "according to this rule" (vi. 15), and St. Basil elsewhere uses the word of persons "walking according to the traditional rule of godliness."* There is no known instance of the word being used of things. So that St. Basil does not suggest the idea of a papal brief being out of agreement with the sound word of the faith, but of a person recommended by a letter from Heaven itself being unsound in the faith. It is obvious that this makes a difference. At the same time, we do not wish to be misunderstood as saying that the highest papal decision could not, according to the teaching of the Vatican Council, contain error. Its reasonings, its history, might conceivably be at fault. They belong to earth ; its conclusion only is, under the special circumstances denoted by the Vatican decree, unquestionably the voice of the Holy Ghost.

But St. Basil in the whole matter proved to be at fault, as men generally do when they oppose themselves to "letters from Rome." Paulinus was not unsound. And the same is the case with another letter (p. 172) which Mr. Puller quotes at some length. St. Basil was mistaken after all. And it is rather hard on Mr. Puller's readers that they should have a case presented to them, on which to ground their faith in the Church of England, wherein St. Basil actually retracted the saying which Mr. Puller quotes (p. 174), and on which Bossuet erroneously commented. St. Basil accused Rome, and the West generally, of supporting heresy by not listening to those who reported the truth in the case of Marcellus. It was not a case which comes under the Vatican definition of infallibility, but it was a serious matter for a bishop to accuse the whole of the West in this indignant way. And St. Basil was wrong. But he was a saint. And a saint, although he may fall into error, is sure to recover himself. St. Basil did make the *amende honorable* in the following year, and wrote to the West, saying, " You are proclaimed to all mortal men as remaining unstained in the faith, and keeping the Apostolic deposit unharmed ; things are not so with us."†

* τῷ παραδοθέντι κανόνι τῆς ἐνορθείας στοιχῶνντας. Cf. also Phil. iii. 16, "to walk according to the same rule ;" and Rom. iv. 12.

† Basil, Ep. 182. Migne.

Students in Church history must be struck with the way in which the words of St. Paul to the local Church of Rome form a sort of refrain in the Saints' utterances about the maintenance of the faith. The Roman clergy quote them to St. Cyprian; St. Cyprian quotes them to the Pope. St. Basil with all his occasional declamation against Rome for not coming to the aid of the East as much as he desired in his zeal for the Church's welfare, can, on occasion, pay the same tribute to the unfailing faith of the Church of Rome.

We should have thought that it scarcely fell within Mr. Puller's subject to reproduce St. Basil's words about the *hauteur* of Rome. It was perpetually objected to St. Basil himself that he was distant and proud; and St. Gregory, of Nazianzum, whilst in one passage of his writings he defends St. Basil from this accusation, in another himself brings it against his brother saint. Two of Mr. Puller's great instances of supposed advocates, among the Saints, of the Anglican theory of Church government are taken—the one from a passage in the life of a great saint, in which he fell into error, and his arguments were refuted by St. Augustine; the other, from a correspondence of which the darkest features are afterwards retracted. St. Cyprian maintaining the invalidity of baptism by heretics, St. Basil accusing Rome and the whole of the West, wrongly, of establishing heresy, are not a solid foundation on which to build a theory and call it that of the Primitive Saints.

We have said that the great flaw in Mr. Puller's book is that he does not define his terms. He sets out to oppose a saying of Cardinal Wiseman's about "communion with" the See of Rome. But it is evident that he has an entirely different view of what is meant by ecclesiastical communion, from that which was held by the Cardinal as a Catholic theologian.

There were various degrees of ecclesiastical communion. A church or person might be placed under anathema; or there might be simply a suspension of ecclesiastical intercourse. Not every local church, nor every person, who was out of communion with Rome in this latter sense, was in schism. If St. Stephen had been asked whether St. Cyprian was the legitimate Bishop of Carthage, and whether any one had a right to set up against him, there can be no question but that he would

have said that St. Cyprian was the only legitimate bishop. Whatever sentence he may have passed on St. Cyprian, it was not that of the *major excommunication*. There was in the early Church an *excommunicatio mortalis*, and an *excommunicatio medicinalis*. If Mr. Puller does not acknowledge this distinction, he should say so. If he does, the greater part of his book falls under the fallacy of *ignoratio elenchi*. When he quotes Mansi in favour of St. Cyprian's excommunication, he should remember that Mansi was a Catholic theologian, and had this distinction before him.

But our remarks have run to a length which precludes us from pursuing this subject further.

We will only point out to Mr. Puller two slips which we feel sure he will, as a matter of literary courtesy, retract in another edition. He misquotes the writer of "Authority, or a Plain Reason for Joining the Church of Rome," on p. 327, and founds on his misquotation a serious charge. If Mr. Puller will look towards the end of the page of "Authority" from which he quotes, he will see that the writer is speaking of Firmilian's statement to the effect that St. Stephen "stood alone," which was certainly false.

Another slip, as we presume it to be, is his citation of Abbé Dupin as a "learned French Roman Catholic theologian." Mr. Puller can hardly have remembered Dupin's history; his delation to the Archbishop of Paris by Bossuet; the sentence on the book from which Mr. Puller quotes; his expulsion by the king, for which the Bishops thanked his Majesty; his persistence in his dangerous anarchist views, persisted in even after his friend Richer had recanted; his widow presenting herself for her dues after his death; or he would not have called him a "Roman Catholic theologian," but a scandal to the Church of France.

But bad as Dupin was, he cuts the ground from under Mr. Puller's feet, when he explains St. Optatus' expression that the See of Carthage was the See of Peter, by referring to St. Cyprian, and saying it is the same teaching as his, the doctrine being that he who breaks with his own bishop,

is rightly said to withdraw from the chair of his own bishop, and from the chair of Peter, that is, from the Apostolic See, with which that bishop is united in communion.

So that even Dupin understood the “one chair” in St. Cyprian’s letter to be what Mr. Puller is so astonished (p. 362) to find it is understood to be by the writer of “Authority, or a Plain Reason for Joining the Church of Rome,” as most certainly the African Bishop, St. Optatus, understood St. Cyprian to mean.

LUKE RIVINGTON.

NOTE.—The writer of the above article is allowed to say here that he has a book in MS. nearly ready, which covers the same ground as Mr. Puller’s book, and will, he hopes, show the untenable character of Mr. P.’s exposition of St. Cyprian’s teaching.

Science Notices.

Resuscitation by Oxygen.—It is a mystery why the use of oxygen as an antidote to asphyxia should have been so long neglected. From time to time it has been advocated by the sages. A century ago Dr. Thomas Beddoes pointed out its value, and the idea had the commendation of other great minds of the eighteenth century. Amongst these were Priestley, Cavendish, Berzelius, Lavoisier, Davy, Dumas, Watt, Fourcroy, Wedgwood, Pearson, and Hey. But notwithstanding this weight of authority, the use of this vital element has been persistently forgotten by the medical profession, and thousands have been allowed to perish for the want of its administration. Colonel Elsdale did good service to humanity by writing the article on “Resuscitation by Oxygen,” which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century*, May 1891, for he once more directed the attention of the medical profession to the neglected remedy and strengthened past arguments in its favour by his description of the courageous and successful experiment which, though a layman, he performed on an apparently lifeless patient. As will be remembered, his story was as follows: One afternoon at Chatham, Colonel Elsdale was informed that one of the sappers under his command had been overpowered by coal gas while he was engaged in emptying a war balloon. When Colonel Elsdale arrived on the spot, he found the man was lying insensible, and to all appearances dead. There was no action of the heart that could be felt and no perceptible breathing. Colonel Elsdale sent off men for medical aid, and placed the man in a position where he could get the benefit of the fresh breeze that was blowing. But the diluted oxygen which sustains life was unavailing to resuscitate the sapper. Colonel Elsdale remembered that he had in his possession some cylinders of compressed pure oxygen which he used for the oxyhydrogen lime-light and he determined to try the effect of undiluted oxygen on the senseless man. There was some risk in trying this experiment as Colonel Elsdale possessed no form of regulator for the flow of gas, and though he turned on the valve as little as possible the gas came out of the cylinder with a tremendous rush, as it was stored at a pressure of over 1000lbs. to the square inch. The salutary effect of the oxygen was almost instantaneous. The sapper revived amid violent convulsions which gradually subsided. Ten minutes later

he was pronounced by the doctor, who had meanwhile arrived, to be out of danger, half an hour later he was walking back to barracks. Next morning he was at work as usual, and felt no ill effects from his gas poisoning. Since Colonel Elsdale's article was published several medical men have adopted the use of pure oxygen in treating cases of acute respiratory affections with more or less success. Dr. Aubrey Blakiston claims to have saved life in two cases by the use of oxygen. Pure oxygen is now so readily manufactured by the Brin process that there is every facility for obtaining it at any time in any quantity. There can be no doubt that it will prove a valuable remedy in many cases of accident, such as when persons are half drowned, when it will probably be a quicker means of bringing back animation than the now practised artificial respiration. It will very likely be extremely valuable in cases where patients have succumbed under chloroform, laughing gas, or other anaesthetics. Also in cases when miners have been overpowered by carbonic acid or choke damp. There is another case of frequent occurrence which suggests itself—suffocation in fires. How often does the fireman penetrate into the conflagration to find the apparently lifeless corpse upon the staircase. When taken into the air he does not recover, and a corpse he remains; but very likely in such a case pure oxygen quickly applied would have been efficient. If so, the cylinders of the compressed gas should be an important feature of fire brigades.

Professor Clowes's Fire-Damp Indicator.—Any invention which tends to diminish the danger of explosion in coal mines deserves the warmest encouragement. It is to be hoped that such will be extended to Professor Clowes, who has successfully brought before public notice what is without doubt the most perfect combination of mining-lamp and fire-damp indicator yet produced. The old-fashioned method of detecting the presence of the ill-boding fire-damp was by observing the pale "cap" formed over the reduced oil-flame of the ordinary safety-lamp in the presence of gas. But such a method is too rough for the requirements of modern investigation. This test, when carefully made, will detect with difficulty 2 per cent. of fire-damp in the air of the mine; but it is sometimes important to detect 1 per cent. or less of fire-damp. Owing to the inadequacy of the ordinary safety-lamp for serving in the joint capacity of detector and illuminator, several inventions have been forthcoming to supply the need of an efficient gas-tester. One of these was designed by Mr. E. H. Livelong, in which the gas-testing principle is the increase in brightness produced in a platinum wire

heated to dull redness by an electric current, when the wire is surrounded by air containing gas. The apparatus forms a delicate gas-tester, but it has the great disadvantage of being useless for illumination, and must therefore be accompanied with a safety-lamp. As it is somewhat cumbrous and heavy, it adds to the load to be carried. Other inventors have recognised the advisability, if not necessity, of combining the illuminator and detector in one piece of apparatus, and have therefore made efforts to improve the ordinary oil safety-lamp, to render it fit for the purpose of detecting gas. In the case of the Davy lamp, the want of delicacy is partly due to the unsuitability of the test flame. Before a test is made the wick of the lamp has to be pulled down until the flame becomes pale and non-luminous. In this condition it is small and of low temperature, and therefore ill-suited to produce flame caps. The cap is also not well seen through the wire gauze protection. MM. Maillard and de Chatelier in 1881 brought out a lamp in which the flame cap is viewed through a glass cylinder instead of through the metallic gauze, and was seen against a dead black background. The lamp flame was also screened from the eye by blackened metal screens. This arrangement was an improvement on the Davy lamp, though the indications of low percentages of gas are feeble, and the screen obscures the light when the lamp is used for illuminating purposes. Professor Clowes has worked in the direction of combining the detector with the illuminator, and seems to have produced an apparatus that is convenient, simple, portable, and efficient. He cannot, however, claim to have originated the principle upon which the success of the apparatus depends. It was suggested by MM. Maillard and De Chatelier in 1881, and by Pieler in 1883. To Professor Clowes belongs the honour of having applied the suggestion in a practical form. The new feature is the employment of a hydrogen flame for the gas test. This hydrogen flame can be adapted to any safety-lamp, but the lamp he prefers to use is the one known as the Ashworth Hepple-White Gray safety-lamp, which is constructed to burn benzoline. The hydrogen gas is supplied from a store of compressed hydrogen, which is a cylinder weighing about a pound and measuring only five inches by one. It is made quickly attachable to the lamp, and forms a convenient handle for supporting it. The gas jet terminating a small-bore copper tube which passes from the outside of the lamp through the oil reservoir, is brought up beside the wick tube. When hydrogen is passed through this tube it is kindled by the lamp flame. The wick is then drawn down until the oil flame is extinguished, and the hydrogen flame is adjusted to standard size by setting its height to that of a wire 10 mm. (0.4 inch) in height, and fixed in the burner of

the lamp. The flame is then ready for gas-testing. When the illuminating flame is again required the wick is pushed up and kindled by contact with the hydrogen flame. The hydrogen flame is then extinguished. Thus a separate flame is used for detecting the fire-damp and illuminating the miner, but for detecting the higher percentages of gas the ordinary oil flame may be used alone in the old-fashioned manner. Professor Clowes claims to have proved the value of his apparatus by a patient and exhaustive series of comparative experiments performed in a test chamber filled with air containing percentages of fire-damp, petroleum vapour, and other gases.

The chief advantages gained by the use of the hydrogen flame in gas testing appears to be—1. That the flame is non-luminous whatever its dimensions may be, therefore it does not interfere with the perception of the cap. 2. The flame is easily adjustable to standard height, and can be made stable at that height until the test is finished, whereas other testing flames are of uncertain dimensions and cannot be got to a certain standard size. The Professor has found that a colza petroleum flame exposed in air containing a low percentage of gas, when twice adjusted gave caps of 8 and of 20 mm. The reduced oil flame sometimes fell so quickly that cap readings with low percentages of gas could not be taken. 3. The caps produced over the hydrogen flame are larger than those produced by any flame of corresponding size; therefore the size of the hydrogen flame can be so far reduced as to enable it to be used in an ordinary safety lamp. 4. The hydrogen flame shows no trace of cap in air that is free from gas, whereas some oil flames such as colza, petroleum, and the benzoline flame show pale mantles in gas free air which is misleading. 5. The standard hydrogen flame burns vigorously and is not likely to be extinguished by accident, whereas the reduced flames generally used in testing burn feebly. 6. Hydrogen gas is supplied practically pure, whereas oil and alcohol vary in purity of composition, and therefore are apt to give flames whose indications vary with the sample of liquid which is being burnt.

Artificial Clouds.—In the spring of 1892 some of the more enterprising proprietors of French vineyards tried to protect their vines from the harmful influence of the night frosts which were exceptionally severe in April and May, by producing artificial clouds in the manner practised by the North American Indians.

These clouds are produced by burning damp straw, or pine branches, which should be constantly watered with a spray. Such artificial clouds act like natural clouds, by forming a screen to arrest

radiation, while their production by combustion causes an agitation of the atmosphere which is a condition unfavourable to the production of frost. Then, too, a large quantity of aqueous vapour condensing by degrees in the atmosphere, produces a considerable amount of heat. Some experimenters have produced their clouds from the combustion of mineral oil which affords smoke in abundance, but the latter system seems to be less efficacious than the one that more closely resembles the operations of Nature. The results of the experiments were not attended with universal success, but it seems that where there was failure it could be accounted for, and can be provided against in the future. The chief cause of failure appears to have been the fact that the proprietors did not continue the production of the clouds for a sufficient number of hours. On one occasion the frost set in very early in the morning, while the clouds were not produced until about 2 or 3 o'clock, so that the harmful influence had been already at work. Then it appears from these recent experiments that it is all important not to discontinue making the clouds too soon after the sun rises, as their presence mitigates the effects of a sudden thaw which is specially deleterious. In the case of the experiments carried on in the Commune of Avensan, the cause of their failure can be entirely attributed to the discontinuance of the clouds. When the sun first appeared everything was going on well. Owing to the screen of artificial clouds, the thaw was gradual and the buds and shoots of the vines were preserved, but at eight o'clock the artificial clouds had dispersed and the buds and shoots were destroyed by the action of the sun; in the words of one of the proprietors, there was not a bud that was not blackened. He adds that the vines would have been preserved if the fires had been relighted at seven o'clock. The fact that certain vines that were protected from the sun at sunrise by walls or other means of shelter suffered less than those that were directly exposed to its action, bears out the wisdom of prolonging the artificial clouds for a certain time after sunrise.

Japanese Magic Mirrors.—Numerous explanations have from time to time been given of the cause of the peculiar phenomena exhibited by certain mirrors made in Japan. As is well known, the front of these mirrors is polished in the usual manner, and there are no forms depicted on the surface, but the back of the mirror is highly ornamented with Japanese characters, designs of flowers, vases, &c. When the polished side of the mirror is held in the path of the rays of a brilliant source of light, it not only reflects on to a

screen the polished surface, but also all the designs which are on the back of the mirror. Sir David Brewster thought this effect was due to the difference of texture in the surfaces causing differences in absorption or polarization, but this view has been since shown to be untenable. The theory now accepted was brought forward by Professors Ayrton and Perry in 1878. These scientists maintain that the patterns seen on the screen are due to differences in the curvature of the surface. At a late meeting of the London Physical Society, Professor S. B. Thompson gave additional evidence in support of their theory by showing some curious and seemingly conclusive experiments with these remarkable mirrors. The Professor covered a mirror with a piece of card in which there was a hole. When he moved the card about the disc of light reflected from the exposed portion varied in size, which shows that the curvatures of portions of the surface were not the same. This fact was also shown by reflecting the light passing through a coarse grating from the mirror when the lines were shown to be distorted. He then put the matter to a test which was demanded by Brewster. He subjected the cast of a mirror which had been metallised, silvered, and polished to the rays of light, and it gave evidence of the pattern reflected from the original. Professor Thompson then developed the discovery of the late Professor Govi, that warming a mirror altered its behaviour. He showed the meeting that a thick mirror which gave no pattern while cold, developed one when heated. He also showed that a glass mirror having a pattern on its back produced the magical effect when it was bent. When made convex the reflected pattern was dark on a light ground, but when made concave light on a dark ground. A conclusive experiment was one in which he wrote on lead foil and then pressed it against an ordinary mirror with a heater when the writing appeared upon the screen. He also showed that some Japanese mirrors which were defective in the "magic" property when imported, could be easily endowed with it by bending them so as to make them more convex.

The Consumption and Sources of Platinum.—The increased consumption of platinum since the invention of the incandescent electric lamp, affords a striking example of the beneficial effect that a new industry can exercise on another that is older but somewhat limited in extent. As is well known, incandescent electric lamps are fitted with platinum terminals, as platinum happens to have the same rate of expansion as glass. Each lamp takes a trifling amount of the metal, but, nevertheless, according to the statement of an

American contemporary, in 1892, 55,000 ounces were absorbed by the incandescent lamp industry. Another important use for platinum is the construction of stills for the concentration of sulphuric acid. The demand for them seems to be on a steady increase, notwithstanding the fact that glass is sometimes used for the concentrating vessels. The average amount of platinum used for these articles, during the last few years, is about 80,000 ounces annually. Platinum is also largely used for dentistry. In the United States the amount used for this purpose amounts to 35,000 ounces annually, and in the United Kingdom to 25,000 ounces. Platinum is also largely used in chemical laboratories for crucibles and other apparatus, and there are other minor uses for the metal, such as for jewelry, ornaments, plating, &c. These latter uses consume about 20,000 ounces annually, so that the total annual consumption of the metal is about 215,000 ounces. Ninety-two per cent. of the platinum used throughout the world comes from the Siberian Urals. The output in 1877 reached its maximum, 4400 kilogrammes. It then dropped to 2700 kilogrammes, and remained at that figure until 1891, when the production amounted to 4226 kilogrammes. It is doubtful whether the Siberian sources will be able to maintain this high level of production. If not, Columbia appears to be a promising future source of the metal. At present it only contributes 125 kilogrammes to the annual consumption, but the platiniferous area is large and adapted to hydraulic mining. British Columbia also produces a small amount of platinum annually (about 65 kilogrammes). In the United States a small quantity of the metal has been found incidental to gold production.

Notes on Social Science.

New Italian Catholic Review of Social Science.—A warm welcome should be given by all Catholics who are interested in social questions to a new periodical that has begun its life in Rome this year. And the beginning is most auspicious, being in the jubilee year of Leo XIII., who, amid many other titles, deserves that of the Pope of the Economists. The periodical is monthly, is entitled *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*, and can be procured at the office at Rome, Via Torre Argentina 76, or at Sadler's in New York, or at Herder's in Freiburg, Baden. One of the most interesting features of the periodical is a sort of review of reviews (*Sunto delle Riviste*) extending over fifty or sixty pages, and including a survey not merely of Italian, but also of French, German, English, American, and even of some Spanish and Portuguese periodicals. There are also notices of books, a "social chronicle," and two or three solid articles in each number. In the first number Mgr. Salvatore Talamo has a full and admirable paper on "Justice in the Sociology of modern Evolutionists," in which he shows among other things the intolerable contradictions in which Mr. Herbert Spencer's ethics are involved. In the February number Canon Milanese treats the question of the origin of the human family with great sense and erudition; the supporters of the bestial theory of human nature and origins have appealed noisily to facts: to the tribunal of facts it is high time they were made to go, and receive their judgment. In the March number of the *Rivista Internazionale*, Professor Bianchi explains the importance and the difficulty of preserving peasant owners against the two great dangers of subdivision and selling up; rightly praises the new German laws of succession to small properties, and the American Homestead Exemption Laws (most of the American farmers are in fact though not in name peasants); also calls attention to the projects of home colonisation, or, as we should say in England, the creation of small holdings, which for us is one of the most urgent social reforms. Finally, in the April number the well-known Catholic Economist, Professor Toniolo, of Pisa begins a study, which promises to be full of interest, on "l'Economia Capitalistica Moderna," perhaps best rendered in English as the Modern Reign of Money. Certainly Italian Catholics deserve to be congratulated on their new periodical; and we whose native speech is English must hope that

before long there may be in America, if not in England, a Catholic organ devoted to setting forth the principles of social science according to the clear and abundant teachings of Leo XIII.

The Christian Social Union and its Organ.—Meanwhile we should follow with interest and sympathy the efforts of the better-minded among our non-Catholic fellow-countrymen, and try to supply the needful supplement or correction to what, with only dim lights to guide them, they are doing in the way of social reform. The *Economic Review*, to which I have more than once directed attention, has now reached its third year, and may be considered for matters of social science as the organ of the Church of England, being published for the Christian Social Union, an association limited to members of that Church. For the January number Mr. Ludlow writes an instructive paper on "Building Societies," which used to be looked on as one of the fairest products of our civilization and a grand example of self-help, but which, alas! like most things human, have become subject to abuses; and often, instead of being the means for working-men to become their own landlords, or to make a safe and honest investment of their savings, building societies have been the means of gambling among the members and of fraudulent enrichment among the promoters. The law has hitherto invited abuses and left the members helpless in the hands of managers and officers; many suggestions for its reform are given by Mr. Ludlow, and some of them have been adopted in the bill regarding building societies now before Parliament.

Lord Wantage and his Work.—Of still wider interest is the article by Lord Wantage, entitled "A few Theories carried into Practice," and showing what can be done by a wealthy, intelligent and resident landlord to restore healthy village life, and prevent the disastrous drain of men into the towns which is a national peril. The author points out one aspect of the evil and a remedy for it:

Those who buy what the farmer has to sell are unfortunately generally not those who live on the land and cultivate the farms. The downs are covered with sheep and the pasture lands with cattle. There is abundance of milk, which goes every day to London, but frequently not a pint of it can be purchased in the localities from whence it comes. Until the meat stores were started in this district, not a morsel of mutton or even a pound of suet could find its way into the labourers' kitchens without their going to the neighbouring town to fetch it, and the bacon there bought generally came from America. In all these matters the labourer has been ill-used, but more from apathy and a lack of thoughtful con-

sideration than from any other cause. What appears to be wanting is a large increase of co-operative institutions, factories, as well as stores, where capable men should have charge of works for grinding and dressing wheat, making butter, baking bread, purveying meat, milk, eggs, butter, &c. The storekeepers should be buyers as well as sellers, and in all cases should have fixed salaries, with a share in the profits of the business done. (P. 29.)

Now Lord Wantage has not confined himself to saying what ought to be done, but has done it; and by starting co-operative stores at Ardington, a remote village amid the Berkshire downs, has delivered his people from the three evils of shop debts, bad articles, and depraved tastes. On the latter, listen to the following passage :

When the stores were first started, the demands of the village people were almost invariably for American produce, such as bacon, tinned meats, cheese, &c., it appearing to be the habit and the interest of the small tradespeople to deal more in these articles than in native produce, the former being cheaper and leaving more room for a profit. The taste of our customers, however, now goes in the direction of English produce, and American tinned meats and bacon are rejected for English bacon and the less choice parts of fresh meat, which are far better, and, in the end, more economical. A butcher's shop is associated with the co-operative stores, which is supplied with prime meat from the adjoining farms, the labourers being thus customers of the farmer or landlord on whose land they work. The unsold parts of the meat are made into sausages, which are very popular, and require only the simplest cooking (p. 31).

Most wisely also Lord Wantage says a little further on :

The interests of all classes would be better promoted if landowners and farmers would endeavour to create around their own homes a market supported by the mechanics and labourers of the district, who would become the farmers' best customers. The object in view is to develop village life, making each large village an independent self-supporting centre, where all necessary industries can be carried on, and where men earning good wages can become the customers of the farmers for whom they work (p. 35).

It ought to be added that this reconstruction of the village market and village life has, both as a condition and a consequence, the restoration of a multitude of small holdings, to which proposition I think Lord Wantage would give his full assent.

How to deal with Alcohol.—The question of the drink traffic is still as burning as ever, and it is unfortunate that among Catholics there is so little agreement on a common line of action against an evil which brings so many of our homes to ruin. In both the January and April numbers of the *Economic Review* there is information on the subject, and all pointing to the same conclusion, that reform is possible, and should be in the shape of much fewer

and thoroughly respectable public-houses, and of good liquor; in particular, that only high-priced and unadulterated spirits should be sold. Lord Wantage has here again given us an example, and has for some time, to use the current phrase, run a tavern in the interests of temperance. The system of American high-licensing described by Mr. Fremantle (p. 114-117 of the January number) would, if reasonably worked, put all public-houses under the control of men bound by the strong inducement of the pocket to make their premises model houses of refreshment. And the clear account (in the April number) of the alcohol monopoly in Switzerland, gives us an example that seems by no means impossible to follow. Carried in the year 1887 by a referendum vote of 267,122 against 138,496, the monopoly of importing and distilling spirits was given to the government; the thorny question of compensation was compromised by the distillers being satisfied with about 45 per cent. of what they asked; the quantity of spirits sold has been reduced by about 20 to 25 per cent., the price being raised, and moreover the quality being much improved, with less risk of injury to health or of exciting a crave for more drink; and the law has rendered the combat easier for those who are fighting against intemperance.

The Weak Point in Church of England Economics.—But while we find so much to praise and admire in this Church of England periodical, we are ever and anon reminded that all rests on an uncertain foundation, and that the writers are confused in their ideas and wavering in their principles. Our business, especially now that we have the lucid encyclicals of Leo XIII. for our guidance, is to help those excellent strivers after social reform, by turning some of the rays of light from Italy to illuminate the London fog. Thus, when the author of the excellent article I have just been considering speaks of the alcohol monopoly as "the greatest step which the Swiss have yet taken in Socialism," we should suggest to him to give a definition of Socialism, and to consider whether this Swiss legislation against alcoholism—legislation which is quite in accord with the functions of the State as laid down by the Pope—deserves to be called socialistic. For Socialism in its most conspicuous form, in the form that now threatens Germany with ruin, is atheistic; as is perfectly recognised by Pope Leo in his condemnations and by Herr Bebel in his affirmations, as when not long ago, in a grand debate in the Reichstag, this leader of the Socialists ended his speech with the notorious lines of Heine, the last of which we may render—

On earth beneath we'll have enough,
 And pile with fruit our barrows;
 The world above we'll gladly leave
 To angels and to sparrows.

Then, again, in a review of the Duke of Argyll's recent work, Mr. Sydney Ball complains that "the Duke's argument is vitiated by the conception of the fixity of human nature." Does the reviewer then forget that in the ordinary sense of language the "fixity of human nature" is a fundamental doctrine of Christian religion? Indeed, amid the many faults of the Duke of Argyll's book one conspicuous merit is precisely the author's insistence on the fact and the importance of recognising in social science that man's nature is corrupted, that he is prone to evil from his youth.*

Finally, Mr. Lyttleton having written some very fair articles on population, he is exposed to criticisms which would have come well from John Stuart Mill, but which look strange in an avowedly Christian periodical; and show that the "intellectual and spiritual hospitality," for which, in the same January number of the *Economic Review*, the Bishop of Durham praises the Church of England, admits some strange guests to her table.

Charles Kingsley as an Economist.—In connection with the social activity and writings of members of the Church of England, we should call attention to a monograph by the Rev. M. Kaufmann, entitled, "Charles Kingsley, Christian Socialist and Reformer," Methuen & Co., 1892. It is difficult for Catholics to have patience with Kingsley, so outrageous and disgusting was his language towards them during most of his life, so monstrous the falsehoods concerning them which in his blindness and folly he so readily believed and so mischievously propagated. But even in purely religious matters he was no irreconcilable foe; on the contrary, as he grew older and the illusions and hopes of his youth faded away, and when the image of Popery he had kept before him was shown, after Cardinal Newman's "Apologia," to be the vilest of caricatures; then he seemed gradually approaching the portals of Holy Church, but was cut off by a premature death. The readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW will remember an admirable article in the number for July 1890 on the origins and course of Kingsley's religious views. Here we are only concerned with his economic views, and in this aspect he deserves our admiration and sympathy. True that here also appear some of the characteristic failings of his youth, his inaccuracy

* For an excellent review, evidently by a Catholic hand, of the Duke of Argyll's "Unseen Foundations of Society," we can refer our readers to the April number of the *Quarterly Review*.

and want of logical and critical power, his optimism and illusions, his insolent and violent language. Indeed, he later on confessed with shame and sorrow

the proud, self-willed, self-conceited spirit which made no allowance for other men's weakness or ignorance; nor again for their superior experience and wisdom on points which I had never considered—which took a pride in shocking and startling and defying, and hitting as hard as I could, and fancied blasphemously, as I think, that the Word of God had come to me only, and went out from me only. (Cited *l.c.* p. 171.)

But then there was much excuse for his violence, for he lived in the England of the fifties, when the poorer classes both in the country and in the manufacturing regions were sunk in a state of misery and degradation the like of which had never been seen since the days of Pagan slavery in the Roman Empire. And what even Paganism had not witnessed was a so-called science teaching loudly that these infamies were part of the nature of things, and stigmatising as fools and fanatics those who sought for a remedy. It required heroic courage in those days to attack that political economy which was then a demigod, though now a broken idol; and three men of great literary powers risked their good name in the attack, namely, Carlyle, Kingsley, and a little later Mr. Ruskin. Of the three, Kingsley has the credit of not having, like the other two, in their avoiding the Scylla of *laissez faire*, fallen into the Charybdis of State Socialism; and yet is equally vigorous in his attack on the miserable delusion that strutted about as modern enlightenment. Thus in the tract on "Cheap Clothes and Nasty" ("a tract full of raving," according to the wise *Edinburgh* reviewer of the day), he wrote:

Sweet competition! Heavenly maid! Nowadays hymned alike by penny-a-liners and philosophers as the ground of all society—the only real preserver of all the earth! Why not of heaven too? Perhaps there is competition among the angels, and Gabriel and Raphael have won their rank by doing the maximum of worship on the minimum of grace. We shall know some day. In the meanwhile, "these are thy works, thou parent of all good"! Man eating man, eaten by man, in every variety of degree and method.

But Kingsley's great merit is not so much in his denunciations of untruths as in his assertion of certain true principles of fundamental importance, that political economy is a moral science intimately connected with religion; that public welfare needs an upper class, but also the performance by that class of its social duties, property being "held in fief of God"; that women are not to be assimilated to men in the social system; above all, that religion and the clergy have a great part to play in social reform, and that Christianity is

the regenerating influence in society. In his earlier days, in "Alton Locke," he exclaims in the person of one of his characters :

If they would be truly priests of God, the priests of the universal Church, they must be priests of the people, priests of the masses. . . . The people can never be themselves without co-operation with the priesthood ; and the priesthood can never be themselves without co-operation with the people.

And of his later years his biographer thus writes :

The great lesson Kingsley tried to impress on his hearers in the crowded lecture-room in Cambridge was the same as that which Ozanam, placed in a similar position, and as unfairly criticised at times by opponents, tried to convey to his pupils at the Sorbonne, that the future welfare of society depends on a new outbreak of the latent forces of Christ's religion. (P. 238.)

We must add, what Mr. Kaufmann by his position cannot add, that whereas Ozanam, when he spoke of "Christ's religion," knew well what he meant, Kingsley was hesitating and obscure, his knowledge of the truths of Christianity being imperfect, his hold on them uncertain, his inconsistencies flagrant. No wonder he laid himself open to criticism ; no wonder he was ill at ease when preaching to a Cambridge audience. But as I have already said, the progression of his mind was upwards ; in the words of Cardinal Newman in the touching letter on Kingsley's death, he was "nearing the Catholic view of things" ; and we may well think that had he lived to our own times, and witnessed on one side the growth of irreligious Socialism and the impotence of irreligious political economy to answer it, and on the other side the chief pastor of Christendom setting forth so clearly the Christian principles of social life, he would have seen where his better aspirations and his zeal for the welfare of the suffering multitudes could find their fulfilment, and would have begged for admission into that Church which in his earlier ignorance and passion he had so often reviled.

CHARLES S. DEVAS.

Notes of Travel and Exploration.

American Exploration of Greenland : "In Arctic Seas" (by Robert N. Keely, jun., M.D.), recently published in London by Messrs. Gay & Bird, gives some interesting details of the Peary Expedition in 1891, together with much that is new and valuable in regard to the climate, physical features, and inhabitants of Northern Greenland. The idea of the expedition originated with Lieutenant Robert Peary, U.S.N., who contributed largely from his own resources to its equipment, the rest of the necessary funds being supplied by the Academy of Sciences of Philadelphia. The explorer and his party, including his wife, were landed with the requisite stores on Murchison Sound, 76° North latitude, in the end of July 1891, there to go into winter quarters. The spring and summer were to be spent in exploration, and the party were to make their way back to the Danish settlements in Southern Greenland in two whaleboats, left for the purpose. The scientific body which sent them out having, however, wisely concluded that the latter part of the programme involved too much risk and hardship, despatched a Relief Expedition in the summer of 1892 to bring the enterprising adventurers home, the *Kite*, which had conveyed them to their destination, being commissioned for that purpose.

The account of Lieutenant Peary's exploration of the inland ice on which he crossed Greenland in a north-easterly direction on a line intersecting the eighty-second parallel, is the most novel portion of the narrative contained in the present volume. From the spot selected for his camp, on the sea level at the head of McCormick Bay, in about 77° N. lat., the land, which is there free from ice and in summer covered with grass and flowers, rises abruptly for some 2000 ft. to the level of the desolate plateau of the interior. On scaling the rugged ascent, a vast plain was seen stretching as far as the eye could reach, covered to within a mile or two of its edge with the immemorial ice-cap. The ground in front of the ice was composed of stones and pebbles with scarcely any intermixture of soil, yet even here a few stunted poppies and buttercups had struggled into blossom. Absolute solitude reigned over the desert of ice, as no living thing can find sustenance upon it, and the portions of Greenland habitable for men or animals are only the strips of coast land fringing its inland steeps. The ice-cap is in

general perfectly smooth, rising by an imperceptible slope to a height of 6000 to 8000 ft. above the sea, but where its convex is broken by the basins of the great fiords running far into the interior, it falls in rugged and precipitous slopes to the vast glaciers discharging into them. Long détours had consequently to be made to avoid these ice-basins, considerably deflecting the line of march in several places. The journey was accomplished by Lieutenant Peary with a single companion, Mr. Eivard Astrup, a young Norwegian, a sledge and team of dogs being their sole means of transport for provisions and other necessaries. The start was made on May 3, and on July 4 the opposite side of the Arctic highlands was reached at the head of a great inlet called Independence Bay in honour of the anniversary. Camp was reached again on August 5, the travellers having made a march of 1700 miles on the double journey. They were met on the last day's march by some of the Relief Expedition who had advanced some distance on the ice when they encountered them. Despite the hardships of a trip made without shelter and for some distance at 8000 ft. above the sea, both travellers returned in perfect health and vigour. Their team, described as "wild wolves, miscalled dogs," had given much trouble in the beginning, sometimes breaking away altogether, and only recaptured with much difficulty and at the cost of severe bites inflicted in the struggle. A disease to which the breed is liable carried off, too, a great many of them, and their number was reduced from thirteen to five before the end of the march.

Results of Lieutenant Peary's Expedition.—The American exploration of the Greenland ice differs from that of Dr. Nansen's in 1888, in having been undertaken much farther north, within a hundred miles of the extreme limit reached by man, while the Norwegian traveller's line of march lay south of the Arctic circle. Its geographical results are consequently incomparably more valuable, as they contribute to our knowledge of the most inaccessible regions of our planet. The most important fact, which may be regarded as conclusively established by Lieutenant Peary, is the insular character of Greenland, and consequent probability of the absence of land of any extent about the Pole. His march lay sufficiently near the northern extremity of the supposed Arctic continent, and his view in all directions was sufficiently extensive to convince him of this, and to enable him to fill up with approximate accuracy the blanks in its coast line between the points at which it has been hitherto touched. This item of knowledge is in itself an invaluable

contribution to the future of hyperborean research, since it proves that there is no hope of finding in this direction that coast-line trending north, regarded as a *sine quâ non* to furnish a breakwater against the drift of the polar pack. Lieutenant Peary, in his report, claims to have effected the delineation of the wholly or partially unknown shores of Inglefield Gulf and Whale Sound, as well as of the northern extension of the great Greenland ice-cap, and to have ascertained the northern limit of the mainland of Greenland, as well as the rapid convergence of its shores above the 78th parallel, and the existence of detached ice-free land masses to the north of it. A large extent of the inland ice was also surveyed and its relief investigated, while a considerable number of glaciers of the first magnitude were discovered by him. Other scientific observations of great interest were made by the experts on the expedition, which brought home an interesting collection of specimens, botanical, zoological, and mineralogical. The only disaster that befell it was the mysterious loss of one of its members, Mr. Verhoeff, its naturalist and mineralogist. Having started alone on an exploratory trip a few days before the date fixed for sailing for home, he never reappeared, and an active search continued in all directions for seven days failed to discover his whereabouts. Some traces of him were, indeed, found on one of the glaciers, but nothing conclusive as to his fate, and the party were compelled to leave without further ascertaining it, as the ice was threatening to block their homeward route. There is some reason to believe that he deliberately hid himself in order to prosecute exploration and research on his own account, having learned that he would not be permitted to remain behind by the leader of the expedition.

The Greenland Eskimos.—The American explorers lived on terms of the greatest amity with the few and scattered tribes of natives to the north of the Danish settlements, who have been rarely visited by Europeans. The largest of their villages is at Cape York, and consists of about a dozen skin, or summer, houses, and twenty stone huts, used only in winter. The inhabitants quickly swarmed on board the ship, anxious to trade all articles of native workmanship, even to their children's toys, for needles, knives, and such small hardware. The younger children caused great amusement by the avidity with which they munched raw birds given them by the sailors, seeming to enjoy them as a civilised child does cakes or candy. After finishing the bird, they invariably rubbed the greasy skin over their faces, as they are taught to do from infancy, since

the coating of fat renders the exposed skin less sensitive to the extreme cold of winter. The ludicrousness of this proceeding was enhanced by its consequences, as some of the feathers remained sticking to the faces of the small aborigines, giving them a most comical appearance. The natives of the village near Whale Sound, where the expedition wintered, showed great grief at its departure, though consoled by the present of such useful commodities as must have rendered the tribe opulent for generations. The lack of both wood and iron makes any implement containing these substances an incalculable treasure to the poor people, and much ingenuity is displayed by them in supplementing their scanty resources in these respects. Joy and excitement produce a curious physical effect upon these savages, causing them to bleed violently at the nose, and the visits of the ship created quite an epidemic of such attacks among them. North of the 73rd parallel, at which the dominion of Denmark ceases, only three groups of natives are known to exist, with an aggregate population of less than 200. In the Danish settlements they number about 10,000, and have assimilated a certain amount of civilisation. At Godthaab they profess Christianity, and their services are performed in their own language by a native preacher. A monthly newspaper is also printed there in Eskimo, of which the publishing, editing, and printing are all done by natives, while the woodcuts with which it is illustrated are also the work of Eskimo engravers. Its name means "That which should be read," and this injunction seems to be obeyed, as it has a large circulation, from Upernivik in the north, to Julianshaab in the south of Danish Greenland. They are very fond of music and dancing, and a ball, in which every man, woman, and child in the settlement takes part, is held every Sunday evening in one of the workshops of Godthaab.

The Island of Saghalien.—The *New York Tribune* gives an interesting account of this isolated fragment of Russian territory, now her principal convict depot in the Pacific. A long irregular strip of land, 560 miles in length, with an average breadth of 60 miles, ranging from a maximum of 120 to a minimum of 17 miles, it extends from the mouth of the Amur southward to the 45th parallel. Despite a latitude which thus corresponds nearly to that of Great Britain, and a similar insular position, its winters are as severe as those of St. Petersburg, and vegetation is consequently scanty, forests of oak, pine, and maple existing only in the extreme south, or in the most sheltered lowlands. Its surface is broken by numerous mountain chains, with an average height of about 2000

feet, some peaks rising a thousand feet higher. The coast is generally cliff-bound, and sandbanks are found only in the north. Despite the scantiness of the vegetation, the island is so rich in game as to be styled "a hunter's paradise," bears, sables, squirrels, deer, and hares being found in abundance. While the rivers are poorly supplied with fish, the sea teems with many varieties, and the sealing and whaling industries, which have subsisted for fifty years back, have attained considerable dimensions, 100 large vessels being employed in the latter, and many millions of roubles annually realised by it. The Russian occupation dates only from 1853, previous to which the interior had only been inhabited by a few thousand Mongolian nomads of various tribes, who lived principally by fishing and hunting, but have now, in some places, devoted themselves to raising vegetables and garden produce. There is also a considerable maritime population of Japanese, most of whom come only for the fishing season, leaving their camps and outfits in charge of the natives when they annually return to their homes. There are also two permanent Japanese settlements on the southern coast, the main industry of one of which is the manufacture of a valuable fertiliser from herrings, caught in vast quantities in the adjoining seas.

The Convict Population.—The isolated position of Saghalien, bounded by the Sea of Okhotsk and the Sea of Japan, separated by the Straits of Laperouse from the northernmost island of the Japanese Archipelago, and from the Asiatic mainland by the Gulf of Tartary, with a minimum breadth of five miles, rendered it especially suitable for a penal colony. Hither, consequently, the worst class of Russian criminals are deported in annually increasing numbers, now averaging a thousand every year. They are divided into two batches of five hundred each, and as since 1884 many of them have been allowed the privilege of taking their wives and families with them, the system has been the foundation of the colonisation of the island. Although the sentence on the convicts is usually one of hard labour on the coal-fields or public works for life, it is in most cases commuted after a term of years into one of simple exile, when the released prisoner is allowed to settle down as a comparatively free man. Many of them become prosperous settlers, owning farms and land, with nothing to distinguish them from the rest of the community save that they are excluded from official society. One man, we are told, who had been a desperate bandit in the heart of Little Russia, died a few years ago, leaving

100 head of cattle, with many acres of fine pasture, and five houses, to his son and daughter, the former of whom is, moreover, being educated at Vladivostock at the expense of the government, preparatory to being sent to study at the School of Mines at St. Petersburg. Free Russian immigrants have also settled in Saghalien, and it is now dotted over with villages, mostly averaging from twenty to one hundred houses. The largest settlement, Rikoff, situated on a river, contains 300 habitations, a large church, a saw-mill, flour-mill, and many other industrial establishments. The island is ruled by a Governor with very large discretionary powers, and is divided into three administrative districts.

The French Soudan.—The most important result of the recent operations in the French Soudan, of which Colonel Achinard has been made Governor, is the prospect it gives of opening up a route from the Niger to Timbuktu. The subjugation of the country of Macina practically places the Tuareg capital, which no European has been allowed to enter for twelve years, in the hands of the French, as it is commercially dependent on the conquered tribes. A French protectorate will therefore probably be accepted by the chief of Timbuktu, and its territory annexed to the Senegal Government.

Commercial Future of Uganda.—An interesting address by Captain Jephson, on “Trade Prospects in Uganda,” is reported in Vol. 8 of the Journal of the Manchester Geographical Society. He describes it as a country which, from its elevation, about 4,000 feet above the sea, is healthy and not excessively hot as compared to India or Australia, while the soil is capable of producing anything. Coffee grows wild there, and the neighbouring Egyptian provinces draw their supply thence. The tea shrub may possibly find a congenial climate in some parts of the interior, and tobacco, which is grown everywhere by the natives, might be cultivated on a very large scale, while an unlimited quantity of oil can be manufactured, as ground nuts grow in profusion. The trade in ivory, of which Uganda has long been the centre of distribution, is not in his opinion likely to become extinct, judging from the immense herds of elephants in the forests of Emin’s province and other districts within the British sphere of influence. Cotton he regards, however, as the great future product of Central Africa, as it grows so freely and gives so large a yield that a very small area of production provides for the wants of the natives. Even half this limited crop is not

consumed, as the process of manufacture on very rough and primitive hand-looms is an extremely slow one. A strong soft texture, almost as warm as flannel, is thus produced, which, when shown by the speaker to a Blackburn manufacturer, was pronounced to be of very good quality. Of course the development of all these natural resources is entirely contingent on the construction of a railway to the coast, as the present cost of transport is prohibitive, and Captain Jephson expressed himself as desirous of helping to create a public feeling on the subject, so strong that no government could venture to disregard it.

Exploration of the Congo.—The same journal contains a paper by Mr. Howard Reed on “The Discovery and Exploration of the Congo,” bringing our knowledge of the geography of the basin of the great stream up to date. The most important work in the study of its southern tributaries was that of Major Wissmann, who, in July, 1884, travelled eastward from the West Coast by way of the Kwanza River, and after leaving that stream struck the Lulua, and founded on it a station and centre of exploration which he called Luluaburg. On May 25, in the following year, the descent of the Kasai was commenced by an expedition numbering 200 men, in a steel boat brought in sections from the coast, and with a flotilla of twenty canoes built at Luluaburg. On June 6 the mouth of a great tributary was reached, which joins the main stream in two arms 830 and 1000 yards wide, and proved to be the Sankuru. The Kasai runs in a north-westerly direction below the junction, attaining in places a width of 3300 yards. The Congo was reached after forty-three days’ journey down the stream, whose confluence was found to be what had been called the mouth of the Kwa, in $3^{\circ} 13' S.$, not, as previously supposed, in the immediate neighbourhood of the Equator. The Kasai, with its great branch, the Sankuru, subsequently explored by Dr. Wolf, adds several hundred miles to the navigable waterways of the Congo basin, and it has, since Major Wissman’s exploration, been ascended by Sir Francis de Winton with two steamers as far as Luluaburg.

An English missionary, the Rev. George Grenfell, has effected a valuable series of voyages of discovery in the little mission steamer *Peace*. On the south of the great river, as Mr. Reed tells us,

He ascended the Lubilash or Boloko for some 200 miles, the Lulongo with its branches for 500 miles, the Chuapo and its feeders for 500 miles, the Lukualli or Kwango for over 200 miles, besides several other smaller streams. His most important work, however, was the discovery and exploration, through about five degrees of latitude, of the great northern

tributary, the Ubangi. This river, which joins the main stream about half a degree to the south of the Equator, follows, for a considerable distance before the confluence, the same general trend as the main river. In consequence of this fact, Mr. Grenfell, when steaming up the Congo along the northern bank, actually ascended the Ubangi for about 100 miles before he realised that he had left the main stream and had unknowingly discovered a new and extensive river. He followed the newly-found stream for about 350 miles, when he reached the Zongo Cataracts, which barred his further progress.

This river has been since found to be identical with the Welle River, discovered in 1870 by Dr. Schweinfurth in his journey through Monbuttu Land, and at first supposed by Stanley to be the Aruwimi. The problem was finally solved in 1889 by Captain Van Gele, an officer of the Congo State, who first attacked it in 1887. He succeeded in that year in dragging his little steamer, the *En Avant*, past the Zongo Cataracts, found by him to be six in number, and extending over a distance of twenty-four miles. The hostility of the natives compelled him to turn back, after reaching a point within sixty or seventy miles of Junker's farthest on the Welle, where he found the river no less than 7800 feet wide. Returning in the following year, he bridged this gap and cleared up one of the still outstanding riddles of African hydrography. The importance of the various discoveries may be gauged by the fact that a railway 250 miles long is already in course of construction to turn the rapids of the Lower Congo, and that some thirty steamers are plying on the upper reaches of the river.

New Route to Australia.—The Canadian Pacific Railway was always regarded as a link between the American and Australasian colonies of England, and the gap in the line of communication is now bridged by the establishment of a steamer service between Vancouver and Sydney. The scheme has originated in Australia with the New Zealand and Australian Steamship Company, formed last year, with its headquarters at Sydney. The alternative of a route which eliminates the passage through the Red Sea, and curtails the long and monotonous sea voyage by the interpolation of an easy and interesting railway journey, will, it is believed, be largely availed of by passenger traffic, which is what is aimed at in the first instance. Goods traffic will probably develop later, as it has done between Vancouver and Japan, to such an extent that the steamers are freighted almost to their utmost capacity. It is thought that Australian beef and mutton will supersede that of Washington and Oregon in the markets of British Columbia, while Australia

would take from Canada agricultural implements, machinery, and soft timber. The duration of the journey from Liverpool to Sydney will be thirty-three and a half days, divided into a sea voyage of six days to Montreal, a land journey of six and a half thence to Vancouver, and a second sea passage of twenty-one days to Sydney. The Canadian Government promise a subsidy of £25,000 a year, and nearly as much is hoped for from the Australasian Colonies.

Agriculture in the Vale of Kashmir.—The fertility of this valley, lying snugly ensconced among the Himalayas at an altitude of 5000 feet, has always been proverbial. Traversed throughout its length of nearly 100 miles by the Jhelum, one of the "Five Streams" of the Punjab, and expanding between unbroken mountain barriers to a width of from twenty to thirty miles, it is believed, according to a writer in the *New York Tribune*, to be the bed of an ancient lake, the traces of whose terraced beaches can still be made out. Steep lateral valleys formed by the tributaries of the main river, debouch into it, and give access to many picturesque coigns of vantage among its mountain scenery. The bottoms of the nullahs or water-courses are the spots in greatest demand for rice culture, owing to the facilities offered by them for irrigation, and this cereal is cultivated at elevations of over 6000 feet above the sea. It is sold at an almost nominal price, as 144 lbs. of the paddy or grain still in the husk may be bought for a rupee, representing after cleaning about 85 lbs. of edible rice. The completion of the railway from the Indian frontier, now in progress, will open up a market to the cultivators which will afford them a much larger profit. Notwithstanding this plenty, the taxes have at times been so high as to reduce the people to starvation, and when driven by their misery to killing cattle for food whole boat-loads of them were taken out and drowned in the lake for this offence against the precepts of the Hindu religion, inculcating the sanctity of the cow. Although excellent claret is made under the directions of a Frenchman in the service of the Maharaja, only about 150 acres are planted with vines, by which a large revenue might be earned from the export of wine to India. The opening of the railway will effect a revolution in this respect also, and will counteract the misrule and oppression which have caused the population of this garden of the East to dwindle down during the last half-century to half the figures at which it previously stood.

Exploration in Egypt.—Mr. Ernest Floyer describes in the *Geographical Journal* the expedition organized by the late Khedive in 1891, which surveyed over 23,000 square miles of desert between the Nile and the Red Sea. The party started from Assuan and reached the coast near the ancient port of Berenice, whence they travelled northward to Kosseir, exploring the country to considerable distances from the main route. Its features consist of a very gradual slope of the sandstone plain upwards from the Nile, culminating in a ridge 7000 feet high, from which it falls more steeply to the sea-coast. The population is scanty, and the water-supply contained in "gults," as the natural reservoirs of rain-water are called. Sheep are fed on the foliage of acacias growing in the valleys among the hills. Ibexes abound, the wild ass still exists, and ostriches have only disappeared within the last twenty years. The mountain mass of porphyry and granite frowning above Berenice shows signs of comparatively recent volcanic activity, though now absolutely quiescent. Mines described 2000 years ago as even then of the greatest antiquity, can still be traced, and Mr. Floyer infers from the geological study of the country that the Troglodytes of Herodotus were not cave-dwellers but miners, whose ancient workings were followed up by the Ptolemaic seekers after mineral treasures. The character of some of the names, which are not Semitic, suggests that the prehistoric miners may have belonged to some of the negro races, who are still mineral workers in Southern Kordofan. Mountain cones of quartz, gneiss, and basalt crop up from the sand, and hills formed of flakes of sandstone on edge are described as looking like mountains of brown paper. The country explored is little known, and almost without food, although the beaten track between Kosseir and the Nile is now marked out in kilometres. One of the five peaks of Jebel Ferayleg, the *Pentedaktylon oros* of Ptolemy Claudius, was named by Mr. Floyer Purdy Peak, in memory of the officer who mapped out the region in 1878.

Notes on foreign Periodicals.

GERMANY.

BY CANON BELLESHEIM, OF AACHEN.

Katholik.—In March issue we have an article devoted to the poems of Leo XIII. Oscar Blank follows up his contributions on the image of Our Blessed Lady as exhibited in the paintings of the Catacombs. These paintings furnish authentic proofs of the Church's doctrine and high veneration paid to the Blessed Virgin. F. Racke, S.J., has a valuable contribution on those truths of Christianity which claim to be urged upon the attention of the faithful, especially in respect of certain errors of social democracy. Canon Höhler, of Limburg, continues his suggestive articles on the test to be applied to the investigations of ecclesiastical history. For illustrating his thesis, and fully establishing the immense difference between the Catholic and Protestant standpoint, he applies to Dr. Harnack, of Berlin, who, although professor of Protestant theology, goes so far as to deny not a few Christian doctrines, especially the divinity of Our Lord. A Catholic, says Dr. Harnack, is bound by the authority of his Church, but a Protestant is depending only on his own authority and judgment. It is to this judgment that he subjects any Christian doctrines which he accepts or rejects, according to his historical investigation. The latter only is his ultimate criterion. Among Catholics it was the late Professor Döllinger who unduly overrated the value of a mere historical test: on the other side there is scarcely to be found any scholar or bishop who has opposed this onesidedness more vigorously than the late lamented Cardinal Manning in his pastorals and other writings published during the controversies connected with the Vatican Council. In the April issue Professor Schmid, of the Episcopal Seminary in Brixen, known to the public by his eminent work on the "Inspiration of the Bible" and other minor essays on intricate questions of dogmatic theology, contributes a pithy article entitled, "Some Reflexions on the Convening of General Councils in Christian Antiquity." We may take for granted that the first eight General Councils were convened by the Emperors. But nothing could be hence deduced against the right perpetually inherent in the Holy See of convening and presiding over General Councils. On the other hand, there is no lack of evidence to testify to the fact that the Holy See in one way or other took part in the convening of the first

eight General Councils. Professor Baeumker, an eminent Catholic philosopher at the University of Breslau, has just edited an unpublished mediæval work. It is "Avencebrolis (Ibn Gebirol) *Fons Vitæ ex Arabiso in Latinum translatus*." The "Fons Vitæ" holds a prominent place in mediæval philosophy, since it mainly emphasized a proposition which urged itself on the attention of Christian philosophers—viz., that all beings, corporal as well as spiritual, are made up of matter and form. This proposition was one of the most noteworthy points of controversy between Franciscans and Dominicans, the former accepting it, the latter, on the contrary, limiting it to the corporal creation. Another notice is devoted to the "Matrikal der Universität Rostock," as edited by Dr. Hofmeister. Founded in 1419, the University very soon rose to a highly flourishing condition, and was visited by many foreigners, amongst whom there were not a few Scotchmen.

Historisch-politische Blätter.—A thoughtful article is devoted to Pauline von Mallinkrodt, whose life has been recently written by Alfred Hüffer. She was sister to Herr von Mallinkrodt, the well-known leader of the Catholics in the German diet, and was foundress of the congregation of the Daughters of Charity. On her death, April 30, 1881, she left not less than eighty-eight houses in Europe and America, with 948 sisters devoting their lives to the education of girls and the nursing of the poor. The first article in the April issue furnishes a thorough criticism on Gregorovius's "Römische Tagebücher." To the English colony in Rome the name and works of Ferdinand Gregorovius are well known. These Roman Diaries are a fascinating work, but full of wanton attacks on Pius IX., which the critic has duly pointed out and rejected. In another article we find traced the history of the Catholic University of Freiburg (Switzerland). Another article is occupied with Mrs. Morgan O'Connell's "Life of Count O'Connell," the last colonel of the Irish Brigade. We may also mention the articles on M. Manitius, "Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie" (Stuttgart, 1891), which deals with the old Irish and Anglo-Saxon poetry; and on F. Pfülf's biography of M. de Mallinkrodt (Freiburg: Herder, 1892). The latter contains valuable lessons for the Catholic nobility in all countries.

Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie (Innsbruck).—F. Michael, S.J., in a useful article, vindicates some mediæval Popes against Dr. Döllinger's unjustifiable attacks. "Reordinations,"

as they are commonly styled, turn out to be simply solemn reconciliations and permissions to exercise an order validly but not lawfully received at the hands of a schismatical bishop. F. Zimmermann passes a severe but well-deserved censure on Professor Nippold's (Jena) defects as a Church historian. To F. Nilles we owe a learned Latin dissertation: *Tolerari potest. De Juridico valore decreti tolerantiae commentarius*, which owes its origin to the American school question. Professor Schmid discusses the question whether we are able to aid *effectively* the souls of the departed.

FRANCE.

Études Religieuses. Jan.-Mai, 1893. Paris: V. Retaux et Fils.
L'Université Catholique. Jan.-Avril, 1893. Lyon: E. Vitte.

The Bible and Modern Criticism.—We put these two periodicals together that we may borrow from the latter an account of a discussion on the "Question Biblique," which is apparently arousing warm interest among French Catholics at this moment, and in which the *Études* plays a part. There is no more conspicuous man just now among French Catholics than Bishop Freppel's successor at the Chamber of Deputies, Mgr. d'Hulst, the able Rector of the Paris Catholic Institute. Recently, to the *Correspondant*, he contributed a popular article* on the authority of the Bible in face of modern rationalist criticism whether scientific or historical, maintaining that it has nothing to fear from either, if the true nature of inspiration is remembered, and the object for which the Bible was written. Passing through some preliminary matter, the gist of the article comes, when having showed that in Catholic teaching God is the principal author of the books of the Bible, Mgr. d'Hulst asks: Is, then, God responsible for *all* that the Bible contains? It contains doctrines and also facts. Its teachings in the matters of faith and morals we know are divine; are also its facts both historical and scientific? Catholic exegetes are, he says, in their reply to this, divisible into three groups. 1. The traditional school, who maintain the exactitude, because of the divine authorship, of every statement in the biblical text, at least if taken in its rational (which may not always be its literal) sense. 2. The broad school (*l'école large*), which admits that there are inexact statements in the Bible. Inspiration extends throughout, but is the guarantee of infallibility

* Now published separately: "La Question Biblique." Par Mgr. d' Hulst. Paris: Poussielgue, 1893. 1 franc.

only in matters pertaining to faith and morals ; particularly, there is no scientific revelation in the Bible, &c. 3. The *via media* (l'école d'opinion moyenne) which " regards the question in a better light," also " est plus sage, et sera probablement plus féconde en progrès." This school extends the effects of inspiration widely enough ; but the intervention of the Holy Spirit in the composition of the sacred books having been with the object of instructing men in salvation, it does not seem to be *à priori* impossible to reconcile the fact of inspiration with the presence in the text of certain documents of purely human origin, the value of which has yet to be verified. But in the application of this principle, Mgr. d'Hulst not only bespeaks care and prudence, but animadverts severely on many of the rationalist hypotheses and the too frequent rash and reckless application of unverified hypotheses. There is no possibility of here reproducing this cautionary portion of the article ; sufficient of it may be read, quoted in the *Université Catholique* for April, from which we ourselves are summarising.

Such an expression of opinion was sure to give rise to opposition. The Abbé Jaugey, in *La Science Catholique* for February, at once entered the lists in defence of the traditional or rigorist school. A month later the Jesuit Père Brucker, a tough adversary, appears in similar defence in the *Études* (March), in an article also headed " La Question Biblique."* In Père Brucker's opinion the Catholic Church has always believed and taught that the inspired Scripture does not contain any error of any sort, and that because it is " the word of God," down even to its smallest parts. He meets the assertion of the " école large," that inspiration extends to the whole Bible, but does not confer infallibility in everything, with this dilemma. The statements which you suppose may be inexact, are *they* inspired or not ? You cannot say they are not, else how can you say that inspiration extends to the whole ? If you answer yes, then you have false statements which, according to yourself, have nevertheless God for their author, which have been written under His positive impulse—for this is the Catholic notion of inspiration, which you admit. But how reconcile such a supposition as this with the divine veracity ? And Père Brucker likes Mgr. d'Hulst's *via media* not at all. In his *brochure* (pp. 20-21), Mgr. d'Hulst, in dividing exegetical opinion into the three schools aforesaid, spoke of them as forming " dans l'armée des défenseurs de la Bible, une aile droite, une aile gauche et un centre." " Quant aux exégètes du centre,"

* This was followed in April by a second, chiefly amplifying some of the statements of the March article.

severely remarks Père Brucker, "parmi lesquels Mgr. d'Hulst lui-même se place, il ne définit pas très nettement leur opinion ; peut-être ont-ils le privilège comme les centres des parlements politiques, de porter leur suffrage tantôt à droite, tantôt à gauche—plus souvent à gauche." And this is the gist of the Jesuit Father's reply, that the traditional doctrine and the rationalist denial leave no logical medium.

The *Science Catholique* for March has admitted a contributor, Padre Savi, a Roman Barnabite, who defends the "école large," basing his defence on Cardinal Franzelin's distinction of the two elements in the sacred books ; the formal and the material element.

Thus stands the discussion at present, except that, as we ought to mention, Mgr. d'Hulst writes a brief note to the *Études* (May) in which he seems to say that in his original article, addressed to the general public, be it remembered, he was indicating solutions held without ecclesiastical censure, by catholic authors rather than maintaining any view of his own, and this for the sake of good Catholics, many of whom are disturbed by the loud assertions of rationalism. He admits that Père Brucker's objections are very weighty, but then they are purely theological, and there remain scientific considerations to be considered. For the rest, he says : "Moi, je ne suis ni avec vous ni contre vous ; j'attends que le progrès de la science ait affermi ou discrédié certaines hypothèses. Si l'Église parle auparavant, mon attente cessera, la cause sera jugée." We conclude by mentioning what we read in the *Études* with great pleasure, the announcement of the near publication in a volume, of a selection from Père Brucker's biblical contributions to the *Études*. His wide knowledge and decisive, nervous style, no less than his recognised ability as a Catholic apologist, will make the volume very acceptable to English readers.

Of the other articles in the five numbers before us of the *Études*, we can only name one or two of the more interesting. A series of articles (Jan., March, April) by Père Abt, exposes the doctrine, plans, &c., of the French Masons as influencing the government of France during the past fifteen years. Theological students will read Père Gonthier's second article (March) on the "Causality of the Sacraments." The April issue contains a sympathetic sketch of the late Cardinal Pitra, apropos of the biography of him just published by the Prior of Solesmes ("Histoire du Cardinal Pitra," par Dom F. Cabrol. Paris : Retaux. Six francs). The May issue has an article by Père Delaporte defending pagan classics in Christian schools against recent impugners, and another by Père Portalié, which defends the Jesuit Père Frius against an attack in the *Revue Thomiste*

(March). It will be remembered that the Dominican Father, Dummermuth, wrote a defence of "prædeterminatio physica," which Père Frius replied to. Of the subjects of both these two last-named articles may we not adopt the introductory remark of Père Delaporte as to the pagan classics—"tout a été dit, mais on continue de parler"?

Out of the numerous articles in the numbers of the *Université Catholique*, one deserves mention—a charming (somewhat poetical) sketch, "Un véritable Organiste Catholique" (February). Lebel, the subject of the sketch, who was blind, was organist at St. Étienne du Morit for thirty-five years, and not only "consecrated his inspirations to the Lord," but in a very remarkable manner studied the spirit of the liturgy with which it was his highest ambition to be always in harmony.

Revue des Questions Historiques.—January and April 1893. French history largely predominates in the January number, but "The History of the French Revolution in Monuments," by M. Victor Pierre, may be recommended as of wide interest—these relics of persons and events are growing rarer with time. "L'Église et les Ordalies au XII siècle" by the Abbé Vacandard appeals to Church historians. In April M. Virey discusses the value of the Hieroglyphic inscriptions for Bible history. "Nouveaux documents sur l'histoire de Marie Stuart," by R. Lambelin, is concerned with some contemporary letters referring to her, discovered by Mr. Maxwell Lyte at Belvoir Castle.

Revue du Monde Catholique, Jan., Mars, Avril 1893 (Paris), and **La Revue Générale**, for the same months (Bruxelles), have reached us. Variety is their pleasing aim—history, science, fiction, biography, and even philosophy—a little of anything interesting or useful to their Catholic readers. There is nothing remarkable in any of the six numbers, yet not a little that would be worth naming if space permitted.

Notices of Books.

Nomenclator Litterarius recentioris Theologie Catholice.

Tomus II. A.C. anno 1664-1763. Edidit HUGO HURTER, S.J.
Editio altera aucta et emendata, Oeniponte. Wagner. 1893.
8vo, 3111-1846 col.

THE first volume of this second corrected and enlarged edition was duly noticed in the DUBLIN REVIEW, October 1892. Without delay it has been followed up by the second volume, comprising the manifold works which were the product of Catholic erudition in the period extending from 1664 to 1763, when the French Church was shedding lustre by her celebrated divines on almost every department of theology. The present volume exhibits not less than 652 theologians. The life, character, and writings of each of these are fully entered into by F. Hurter. He has, nevertheless, spared no pains to avail himself of the best and most recent literature bearing on his subject. The article on Bossuet affords an accurate idea of the extensive researches and sound theological judgment of F. Hurter. As to Great Britain and Ireland it is refreshing to become acquainted with a host of theologians all intent in defending or expounding the deposit of Christian faith. The "tabulae chronologicae theologorum," the index of names and subject-matters, are excellently done. On the whole this book is an indispensable requisite to students in theology and history.

B.

Vetus Hymnarium Ecclesiasticum Hungariæ. Cura et im-
pensis JOSEPHI DANKÓ, Praepositi s. Martin de Posoniv. Budapestini. 1893. 8vo, pp. xv—599.

IT was in the National Synod convened A.D. 1630 by Cardinal Pazmany, Archbishop of Gran and Primate of Hungary, that the Hungarian rite was abolished and the Roman rite introduced throughout Hungary. Consequent on this change followed the fact that the hymns formerly in use, in the course of time were all but totally obliterated. Hence we may congratulate Mgr. Dankó, Provost of Pressburg, for having performed a really meritorious work by collecting and issuing those beautiful and ecclesiastical hymns in which his forefathers gave expression to their faith and piety. The way in

which he has acquitted himself of his task gives ample proof of his learning and critical acumen. An introduction, covering not less than 145 pages, comments on the origin and value of the Church's hymns, describing in a masterly way the various liturgical manuscripts from which the texts in this collection are gathered and, finally, closes with an inquiry into the development of sacred music. To afford the reader an idea of the amount of labour undergone by Mgr. Dankó, it will suffice to point out that he has consulted and accurately sifted not less than fifty-five unprinted liturgical manuscripts covering the time from the twelfth to the fourteenth century. Amongst these there is one document which claims our interest from its connection with Scotland or Ireland. It is a precious manuscript of a Breviary of the fourteenth century in the library of "S. Maria Scotorum," Vienna. As to the liturgical texts themselves, they are divided into three parts. The first contains the hymns, anthems and sequences in honour of the saintly patrons of Hungary; then follow the "cantiones sacrae de tempore, festis et sanctis." Every hymn is accompanied by copious notes shedding light on questions of critical, liturgical, or dogmatic importance. In not a few cases Mgr. Dankó has been enabled to supply better and purer texts than those we meet with in John Julian's otherwise valuable "Dictionary of Hymnology" (London : Murray. 1892). Besides, in other cases he supplements the latter work by his unwearyed and successful researches. The Hymnarium is concluded by two hitherto unpublished documents, a Kalendarium of the Cathedral of Gran of the fourteenth century, and an Ordinarius (modern Directory) of the same cathedral written in the fifteenth century. As Mgr. Dankó had the Hymnarium specially brought out at his own expense, it cannot be obtained by booksellers, but he has allowed that public libraries may buy it from Mr. Harrassowitz, bookseller in Leipzig.

BELLESHEIM.

Johannes Janssen. *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters.* Fünfter Band. Dreizehnte und vierzehnte verbesserte Auflage, besorgt durch **LUDWIG PASTOR.** Freiburg: Herder. 1893. 8vo, pp. xlvi—754.

THE late lamented Professor Janssen's famous history of the German people from the end of the Middle Ages, continues to enjoy an ever-increasing popularity amongst both Catholics and the more candid class of Protestant readers. This is unmistakably evidenced by the thirteenth and fourteenth editions of the fifth

volume. Professor Janssen's gifted disciple, who inherited his manuscripts, and has portrayed the celebrated historian in an elaborate biography, has just performed the important task of publishing a new edition of volume the fifth describing the revolution in polities and ecclesiastical affairs from 1580 to 1618. The reissue appears to be all that could be anticipated from the zeal of Professor Pastor, who has left nothing undone to bring the work up to the requirements of modern historiography. There is hardly a single page that does not testify to the editor's painstaking care in supplementing or correcting the original text. Volume the seventh, which was left unfinished by Janssen, will ere long be brought out by Professor Pastor.

B.

Entstehung und erste Entwicklung der Katechismen des seligen Petrus Canisius, S.J. Geschichtlich Dargelegt von OTTO BRAUNSBERGER, S.J. Freiburg: Herder. 1893.

IT was in September 1864 when Pius IX. celebrated the Beatification of Venerable Peter Canisius, who was born in Nymwegen A.D. 1521, and expired in Fribourg (Switzerland), A.D. 1597. From that time the Fathers of the German Province of the Society of Jesus have devoted their efforts towards illustrating the life of Peter Canisius, who through his missionary labours and theological attainments has preserved thousands of souls to the unity of the Catholic Church during the stormy period of the Reformation. Next to his remarkable abilities as a preacher, and his theological writings, he owed his great successes to the publication of his Catechism. To the study of the origin and the vicissitudes of this excellent book is devoted the present essay of F. Braunsberger.

In order to do his work thoroughly the author has visited the principal libraries in Europe, from England to Hungary, and from Upsala to Naples, in search of the best editions for his task. After expatiating on the worldwide fame Canisius acquired as a catechist, he treats on the three forms of the Catechism, and is careful to establish with accuracy the year in which the first edition made its appearance in Vienna. It was not in 1554, as the common opinion takes for granted, but rather in 1555. The fact is noted that the title of the first edition was "Summa doctrinæ christianæ," and that the work was written in Latin. F. Braunsberger sets forth the reasons which led Canisius to adopt this language, and goes on to justify the title which seems to be in full accordance with the mediæval "Summæ." The speciality of the Catechism is the strong

relief in which are brought out the Bible and the works of the Fathers. Not indeed as if F. Canisius had been unacquainted with the doctrine of the Schoolmen—on the contrary, he was deeply versed in their writings, as we see amply by his Treatise on Sin—but it ought to be borne in mind that the reformers' appeal to the primitive Church could only be successfully dealt with by carrying the issues to the bar of that period of ecclesiastical history. In the recent controversies on the Pope's infallibility, Blessed Canisius's doctrine has been wantonly attacked. Hence F. Braunsberger proves beyond the slightest doubt that Canisius did not in the least deviate from the general doctrine of the Church, but strongly supported the infallibility of the Holy See. A most valuable chapter describes the connection between Canisius and the famous printing-houses of Plantin at Antwerp, and Cholin at Cologne. It was Plantin who brought out the Catechism illustrated with pictures. This chapter is a useful contribution towards the history of the development of printing. In these days of Authors' Unions, it is interesting to note that Canisius, notwithstanding the enormous labour sustained in bringing out his books, received no monetary return, but showed himself quite content with obtaining from the publisher some works of the great Fathers of the Church. The chapter describing the success of the Catechism is most consoling, and affords an idea of what a single man, animated by the Holy Spirit, may effect for the honour of God, and the cause of the Church. We are led to anticipate the publication of a further essay, which is to treat of the translations of the catechism in the several languages. The excellent registers and indexes of the work deserve a word of a special praise.

BELLESHEIM.

L'Université de Pont-à-Mousson (1572–1768). Par l'abbé EUGÈNE MARTIN. Paris et Nancy : Berger-Levrault et Cie. 1891. 8vo, pp. xix–455.

WE are glad to render the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW acquainted with an exhaustive and singularly painstaking history of the University of Pont-à-Mousson, in the old Duchy of Lorraine. This noble institution, intimately connected with France, Germany, and for a considerable time with Great Britain, has at length found its historiographer, who has performed his work with great ability. He has not limited himself to the immense range of printed works, and has successfully ransacked the archives of his native country Lorraine, also the rich materials heaped up in the national archives of Paris. Whilst the first part

is devoted to the external history of the Alma Mater, describing the foundation by Gregory XIII., its rapid development and gradual decline, the second is a storehouse of historical information on the interior life of the University—viz., the course of studies, the exercises of piety, and the principles on which the discipline was conducted. The prince of the Church who originated the idea of the University was the Great Cardinal de Lorraine, as he is commonly called in the Acts of the Council of Trent, the uncle of Mary, Queen of Scots. It was after having taken part in the conclave of 1572 that he entered into negotiations with the new Pope, Gregory XIII., of whom he obtained, in 1572, the solemn Bull of erection of the University whose administration was to be confided to the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. The Society, notwithstanding embarrassing difficulties, which arose in part from political complications and partly from dissensions between the several faculties of the University, presided over the destinies of the University down to the day of its suppression. Indeed, a diligent perusal of the thoughtful work of Abbé Martin leaves no doubt but that the University of Pont-à-Mousson for two entire centuries had proved a bulwark of the Catholic faith against heresy and French infidelity. No English or Scotch scholar will go through his work without being deeply impressed by the splendid record of some of his countrymen. Let me instance the name of the first rector of the new institution, F. Edmond Hay, a Scotchman, and his nephew, John Hay. To the former, who came from the University of Dilligen, Pont-à-Mousson was indebted for its first statutes. Another Scotchman who taught theology in Pont-à-Mousson, was F. John Gordon, whilst John Barclay became celebrated as a distinguished professor of civil and canon law. It was in 1581 that Mary, Queen of Scots, supported by Gregory XIII., founded in Pont-à-Mousson a seminary for the education of missionary priests for Ireland and Scotland which, however, in 1591 was transferred to Douay. A brilliant page of Abbé Martin's work is found in the chapters descriptive of those numberless seminaries which gathered round the University as their nucleus, and were the radiating centres of sound doctrine and Catholic discipline throughout Lorraine. We esteem this book to be a solid contribution to the history of Catholic education. We especially commend the manner in which the work has been enriched by excellent indexes, registers, and maps.

A. BELLESHEIM.

Literary, Scientific, and Political Views of Orestes A. Brownson. Selected from his works by HENRY F. BROWNSON. 8vo, pp. 418 New York, Cincinnati, Chicago : Benziger Brothers. 1893.

CHARLES LAMB relates, in his delightful essay on "Imperfect Sympathies," that he once ventured, in the presence of a Scotchman, to characterise a certain book as a "healthy book." "Did I catch rightly what you said?" asked the matter-of-fact Caledonian ; "I have heard of a man in health, and of a healthy state of body, but I do not see how that epithet can properly be applied to a book." In spite of the worthy Scotchman's objection to the expression, we do most emphatically declare that "Brownson's Views" is an eminently healthy book. It is pulsating from beginning to end with vigorous and manly life. To open it at haphazard and read the first pages that meet the eye is like enjoying a breeze from the hill-tops. The subject-matter is throughout full of interest. Literature, education, the sciences, civil and religious liberty, &c., are discussed, and always from the standpoint of a vigilant and thorough Catholic. The treatment of the various subjects is frequently original, always masterly. The style occasionally bears witness to the influence of Emerson, but the thoughts are those of a strong self-reliant man who sees with his own eyes and judges for himself. It is difficult to make selection where everything is good ; but let the following extract from the essay on Sentimentalism serve as a specimen of Brownson's cast of thought :

Catholic literature is robust and healthy, of a ruddy complexion, and full of life. It knows no sadness but sadness for sin, and it rejoices evermore. It eschews melancholy as the devil's best friend on earth, abhors the morbid sentimentality which feeds upon itself and grows on what it feeds on. It may be grave, but it never mopes ; tender and affectionate, but never weak or sickly. It washes its face, anoints its head, puts on its festive robes, goes forth into the fresh air, the bright sunshine, and, when occasion requires, rings out the merry laugh that does one's heart good to hear. England is sad enough to-day, and her people seem to sit in the region and shadow of death ; but in good old Catholic times she was known the world over as "Merry England." It is on principle the Catholic approves such gladsome and smiling literature. It is only in the free and joyous spirit that religion can do her perfect work ; for it is only such a spirit that has the self-possession, the strength, the energy requisite for the every-day duties of life.

Mr. Henry F. Brownson, in presenting us with this excellent compilation, has not only acquitted himself of a duty to the memory of his illustrious father, but, by making the best thoughts of one of our best writers accessible to the many, he has also rendered an eminent service to Catholic literature. We strongly recommend "Brownson's Views" to our readers, and emphatically declare it to be one of the healthiest books that have come our way this long while.

The Church and the Roman Empire before A.D. 170. By Professor W. M. RAMSAY, M.A. 8vo, pp. xiv.-494. Price 12s. London : Hodder & Stoughton. 1893.

THIS learned work contains a great variety of material of interest to the student of the time with which it deals. Its nucleus is made up of six lectures delivered at Mansfield College during May and June 1892. These treat of the relation of the State to the Christian Church ; and the author arrives at conclusions which are to some extent novel. He shows that in Asia Minor at least Christianity was at first received with favour, and that it only came to be disliked when it interfered with trade, or caused annoyance to families by the conversion of individuals. Various charges were brought against Christians for these personal reasons ; and it was soon found by those who were aggrieved that the Roman officials would listen to charges of breach of the peace, riot, or sacrilege, but that they derided purely religious accusations. Nero's example made the provincial governors more likely to press hardly on the Christians, but they were still punished as ordinary criminals and not for their religion, except under the Jewish autonomy, where they could be dealt with for their religion alone, until that jurisdiction was abolished in A.D. 70. The dislike of Christians gradually deepened into hatred among all classes, on account of the numberless ways in which their religion was in opposition to the ancient political and social system, but until A.D. 75 to 80 no change took place in the imperial policy. Titus expected that with the destruction of Jerusalem, Christians as well as Jews would lose their religious centre, and would cease to be an independent element in the Empire. When the Flavian Emperors found this was not the case, they felt bound to crush a system which preserved an unity independent of the State, which was contrary to the first principle of the Roman policy. Like Catholics in England in our own day, the Christians "looked on themselves as Christians first, and Roman subjects afterwards," and this was an unpardonable offence.

To this main part of the book is prefixed a very minute account of St. Paul's journey in Asia Minor, which the author shows to be so correct, even to the smallest details that can be examined, as to suggest irresistibly that the account given of them in the Acts must have been written down under the immediate influence of St. Paul himself. This conclusion is the more valuable because we learn that Professor Ramsay formerly looked upon Acts xiii.-xxi. with much suspicion, and has only gradually convinced himself of its absolute correctness by the study of contemporaneous history.

There are other points of great interest in this book. Thus it is shown that the Acts of Paul and Thekla—extravagant as they are in their present form—almost certainly contain a nucleus of historical truth dating as far back as the reign of Claudius or Nero. There is incidentally a very interesting discussion as to the date of St. Peter's martyrdom, which the author shows reason for believing must have been considerably later than Nero. The value of the additions in Beza's "Codex" to the received text of the Acts is also examined, with the remarkable result, that they are found to argue a very accurate knowledge of Asia Minor in the Apostolic period, the reviser's acquaintance with Europe being less correct, so that he must have been intimately familiar with the topography and traditions of the former country, and not have lived later than the middle of the second century.

It will be seen that the foregoing notice is a wholly inadequate account of a volume full of detail; but it will serve to show students that it is indispensable for those who wish to inform themselves as to the period with which it deals.

Carmina Mariana. An English Anthology in Verse in honour of or in relation to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Collected by ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Spottiswoode & Co. 1893.

EVERY lover of religious poetry will owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Orby Shipley for the beautiful collection of verse in honour of our Lady which he has here brought together. His design has been to gather into one volume all English verse bearing on his subject, from Chaucer to Tennyson, excepting only familiar devotional poetry and unpublished verse, save a few translations. Great part of the volume consists of extracts from longer poems; the rest gives shorter poems, chiefly lyrical, old English poetry modernised with judgment, and a few choice translations from other languages. Among the shorter tributes to our Lady are many fugitive pieces—English, Irish, and American—which would otherwise have been lost in the pages of old periodicals, sometimes of great beauty, and which it is an especial merit of Mr. Orby Shipley's to have preserved. It is particularly interesting to observe how large a part of the volume is made up of poems by non-Catholic writers, and how beautifully even those express themselves who have no belief in the divinity of Mary's Son: a striking example of the *testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ*. The volume is headed with a very graceful and touching dedication to the revered memory of Cardinal Manning, "who encouraged the idea of our Blessed Lady's Anthology, and

counselled its development." If we have any quarrel with the editor, it is that he has kept himself too persistently in the background, and let us judge of his critical skill and taste only by the very delightful volume he has produced.

St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity. By the Abbé C. FOUARD. Translated by GEORGE F. X. GRIFFITH, with an Introduction by CARDINAL GIBBONS. 8vo, pp. 415. Price 9s. London : Longmans & Co. 1892.

THIS volume is a continuation of the Abbé Fouard's "Life of Our Lord," which is too well known to our readers to need any commendation on our part. The author had originally intended giving it the title of "Saint Paul," believing that the history of the beginnings of the Church was simply the life of that great Apostle. But, as the work advanced, he found that another personality stood out as pre-eminent, while St. Paul was still only a layman, and that the earliest development of the Christian Church was summed up in the history of its head. The first part of the book, then, coincides with that portion of the book of Acts which precedes St. Paul's ordination at Antioch; at which point the narrative is taken up by another volume—"Saint Paul"—already translated; and it may be confidently recommended as the best commentary on this part of Holy Scripture accessible to the English Catholic reader. The remainder of the volume treats of the dispersion of the Apostles, the means they took by oral and written teaching to provide for the definite teaching of the Gospel; St. Peter's arrival in Rome, and the condition of the Jews there and of heathen society at the time of his arrival. All these subjects are dealt with in an agreeable and easy style, which veils an unobtrusive wealth of solid learning, on which the whole is based. Of course the author's conclusions will not always be unassailable; for instance, we are inclined to think his account of heathen life in Rome too uniformly sombre, and we do not think he has altogether escaped from the chronological difficulties which the Acts raise; but these are details on which no critic would lay stress, even if he ventured to differ from one of such wide reading as the Abbé Fouard. We have said enough to show that English readers will be grateful to Mr. Griffith for placing so excellent a work within their reach, and only regret that the frequent Americanisms will interfere with the satisfaction with which English readers would study the book. The least fastidious person in this country would be teased by the use of "whipping" instead of "scourging" in serious

narrative, and not a few phrases of the same kind might be pointed out. The book is excellently printed, and fully provided with maps and plans.

Foregleams of Christianity. An Essay on the Religious History of Antiquity. By CHARLES NEWTON SCOTT. Revised and enlarged edition, pp. 223. London : Smith, Elder & Co. 1893.

THIS book, on its first appearance, met with much favour from the critics. Nevertheless, we cannot honestly say that we consider it, on the whole, a satisfactory work. The apparent purpose of the author is to prove that (1) "in the creed of Christianity the vital truths of all the religions which preceded it find a place, and their proper place ;" (2) "that the more spiritually advanced is a religion, the more necessary are the doctrines, complementary to each other, of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement, to secure its metaphysical system from contradiction either with facts or with itself ;" (3) "that the Incarnation was delayed until the religious education of the most progressive races of mankind was sufficiently advanced for them to appreciate and welcome the Atonement." The first proposition is, to a Christian, incontrovertible. But Mr. Scott, for the sake, we presume, of those who are not Christians, undertakes to establish it. His attempt is, we think, not successful, and this because he seeks vital truth where truth is not to be found. He gives us much interesting information on Fetishism, Pantheism, &c. But he fails to prove his contention that what was best in these systems has its place in Christianity. The Catholic Church, following the guidance of God, employs sensible symbols to excite religious emotions and to impress the mind with the truths of Faith. But we are unable to discover a "foregleam" of this sacred symbolism in Fetishism, which, to use the author's own words, "concludes that the substance of the Divine is not to be sought farther than in matter." Again, where is the "foregleam" of Christianity in Pantheistic Monotheism, which, as the author confesses, "has little beyond the idea of Divine unity in common with the Monotheism of Theism," especially when we consider that this Pantheistic unity "can admit the existence of any number of beings ?" The author's promise is better than his fulfilment. His analogies remind us of those which Dr Johnson condemned as "far-fetched, and not worth the carriage."

The second proposition of our author seems to us to accord with the theory which may be traced back to Günther, and was advocated by Canon Aubrey Moore, one of the writers of "Lux Mundi"

—viz., that we can claim reason on our side against all Unitarian theories, and that the doctrine of the Divine unity can only be rationally maintained when supplemented by the doctrine of the Trinity. This theory, already severely censured by S. Thomas ("Sum. Theol." 1^{ma} q. 32, a. 1), was condemned by the Council of Cologne in 1860.

The author's third proposition we take to be misleading. That, by the time of our Lord's coming, the religion of "the most progressive races" had grown somewhat refined and spiritualised is undisputed. But that the propagation of Christianity was thereby made an easy task, as the author's words would seem to imply, we must refuse to admit. Cardinal Hergenröther ("Kirchengeschite," B. 1, No. 103) enumerates no less than twenty obstacles which opposed the spread of the Gospel teaching. In truth, the very fact that the Gentile worship was now more spiritual and soul-satisfying, was employed as an argument against the acceptance of Christianity. The eclectic theologians of Neo-Platonism, selecting what was best from the various Pagan sources, taking their practical theology chiefly from the Stoics, and their speculative theology chiefly from Plato, and filling up the *lacunæ* with truths appropriated from Christianity, built up systems of moral and dogmatic theology which, they asserted, were in no way inferior to the Christian. And, like the Ritualists of to-day, who owe their systems to similar methods, they urged, often only too successfully, "Why leave us, when you can find all you desire here"?

There are various individual passages in this book of which we greatly disapprove—*e.g.*, the description of Julian the Apostate, as "the austere and quite saintly Julian"; but without calling special attention to these passages, let us say once more that though "Foregleams of Christianity" contains much that is both useful and interesting, we cannot consider it as, on the whole, a satisfactory work.

The Marriage Process in the United States. By Rev. S. B. SMITH, D.D., Author of "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law," "The New Procedure," "Compendium Juris Canonici," &c. &c., pp. 435. London: Burns and Oates. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

AS is well known, the Canon Law required that certain distinctly determined judicial formalities should characterise all ecclesiastical processes which bear upon the validity of marriages. However, till the year 1884, these formalities were not observed in the

United States. Disputes concerning the validity of marriages, even those which affected the validity of marriages already contracted, were decided by the bishops, or by the rectors of parishes, and sometimes even by assistant priests, without any judicial formalities whatever. This mode of procedure was not only inconsistent with the common practice of the Church, but was also open to great abuses. To remedy this defect the S. C. de Prop. Fide drew up, in 1884, the Instruction *Causæ Matrimoniales*, which determined the procedure to be followed in the United States in matrimonial contentions affecting the validity of marriages already contracted.

The book under review is in great part based on this "Instruction." It seems to us that the title, "The Marriage Process in the United States," does not sufficiently cover the range or sufficiently express the usefulness of Dr. Smith's very able work. And this for two reasons. First, because the forms of procedure explained by the author are not, as we might infer from the title of the book, peculiar to the United States, but are substantially those that are prescribed by the general law of the Church. The aim of the "Instruction" was not to provide special legislation for the United States, but to effect that ecclesiastical marriage-trials should be conducted in that country in accordance with the ordinary practice of the Church. Secondly, because, although it be true that Dr. Smith, in the work before us, devotes himself chiefly to the exposition of the formalities which should accompany the various stages of matrimonial processes, nevertheless in no less than 155 pages he discusses the questions of still more general interest which bear upon the nature of marriage, competence in matrimonial causes, and the various kinds of diriment impediments. Our author writes throughout with great clearness and ability, and proves himself a thorough master of his subject. Where he finds authors divided in opinion, he sums up their several positions with great fairness and impartiality. His own opinion, in such cases, he rather insinuates than insists upon. As a specimen of Dr. Smith's judicial manner, we should like to quote, if space permitted, his discussion of the very interesting questions: "Can a married couple, who are Catholics, ever apply to the secular courts for an absolute divorce—that is, for a total annulment of their marriage? Can a Catholic judge grant it? Can a Catholic lawyer undertake the obtaining of it?" But for the solution of these and of many other interesting questions we must refer our readers to Dr. Smith's work, which we sincerely commend as highly useful not only to the student of Canon Law, but also to the general theological student.

History of English. By A. C. CHAMPNEY, M.A. London : Percival and Co. 1893. 8vo, pp. 414.

IN the opening words of the preface to this work Mr. Champney expresses the fear that it is somewhat daring of an amateur like himself to write a book on the history of the English language. But after a careful examination of the result of his labours we must needs confess that we are gratified that he has so dared. His practical experience in the teaching of English has evidently led him to conclusions, as to the difficulty of the work, similar to those which it has forced upon others engaged in the same pursuit. His experience has proved a valuable guide. He modestly disclaims any personal authority upon the subject other than that which has been gained from a diligent study of the best text-books. He has, however, produced a work which is at once brightly written, clear and consecutive in arrangement, and sufficiently comprehensive in its grasp to prove a real boon to those engaged either in private study or in directing the studies of others in the history of the English language. The ordinary text-books, for reasons sufficiently manifest, and from the necessities of the case, are either too bald and meagre, or too heavily weighted with close technical details to enable the student to glean from them, without long study and much careful thought, anything like a vivid, intelligent, and comprehensive view of the whole subject. They mention the sources of the language, its periods of growth, and the changes that occurred therein, but they furnish in illustration few examples or none taken from the literature of those periods. The consequence is that the student of language is as much at sea as would be the student of anatomy, who had to gather his first knowledge of the human frame from a mere description, unassisted by drawings or specimens of bones.

In Mr. Champney's work, after a lucid little chapter on the life of a language, we have a consecutive history of English, traced back to the Indo-European, and then explained and illustrated by copious examples through Anglo-Saxon, and through the many additions and changes which have gradually evolved the language as it is to-day. Attention is called to the interesting subject of the various dialects and their distinctive features, to the rise therefrom of standard literary English, and to the peculiarities which distinguished the speech and writings of Englishmen in the sixteenth century.

The work is well printed, but unfortunately, we think, the pages are uncut and uneven. This is certainly a hindrance when quick reference is desired. We can cordially recommend Mr. Champney's

book to all who desire to infuse something like life and connection into the necessarily curt and jerky information one meets with in text-books on historical grammar, or to assimilate and illustrate the facts contained in them.

J. B. MILBURN.

The Victorian Age of English Literature. By MRS. OLIPHANT and F. R. OLIPHANT, B.A. Two vols., 8vo, pp. 334 and 351. London : Perceval & Co. 1892.

THE authors of this work have done for the history of Victorian literature what Mr. Justice McCarthy has accomplished for the polities of the same period by his "History of Our Own Times." There is a parallelism in the two efforts. It is doubtless as rash to attempt to determine the final place in literature of contemporary writers, as it is to venture on the delineation of the true perspective and relative importance of political characters and events still in progress, or fresh in the memory of living men. As the authors admit in their preface, contemporary judgment is often sadly erroneous. Accordingly, they do not profess to be able to give a final decision. They write for the day, for the information and direction of those who desire a brief and readable survey of a vast subject. At the same time, we take it, there is nothing to prevent what they say voicing the feelings of to-day, and thus furnishing valuable contemporary evidence in the court of posterity, where the ultimate verdict will be given. Surely the filling of the niches in the Temple of Fame should not be left altogether to the aftertime, without a voice from the present being raised in recommendation or suggestion.

The work before us deals not unsuccessfully with a wide and difficult subject. Volume i. contains six chapters. After a sketch of the state of literature at the Queen's accession, men already famous, the essayists, the early novelists, and the greater Victorian poets, are considered. In volume ii. attention is turned to the theological, scientific, philosophical writers and art critics. Then the younger poets and novelists are brought into court, and the work is closed by a notice of the present condition of literature and a review of the leading periodicals and newspapers.

Mrs. Oliphant's is a well-known name in the literature which she has undertaken to describe, though her modesty allows her to do no more than mention herself among the younger novelists. She is a prolific writer, and has earned repute as a novelist, a biographer, and a translator, notably of Montalembert's "Monks of the West." In the work now under consideration, she has been assisted by F. R.

Oliphant. She has set herself a heavy task. The field is vast, the range well-nigh unlimited, and the difficulties many. In spite of all obstacles, however, the book is eminently clear and thoroughly readable. The style is graphic and picturesque, though occasionally weighted by sentences long and involved. Though we can scarcely agree with the summary manner in which such a clear, judicial, and even vivid writer as Lingard is dismissed ; though we cannot refrain a smile when, in considering Cardinal Newman's attitude at his conversion, Mrs. Oliphant makes a curious distinction between "the fundamental truths of religion" on the one hand, and "Apostolic succession, unbroken tradition, the divine commission of the ecclesiastical body, whose special teachings, whatever they might be, were comparatively indifferent to him in comparison," on the other ; we feel bound to add that many of Mrs. Oliphant's judgments will recommend themselves to her readers.

As instances of happy expression of what will probably be acceptable opinions we might refer to the following. Of Macaulay's history she writes :

Whatever may be its value as a correct record of fact, Macaulay's history is certainly a very remarkable production of literary art. It is perhaps one of the greatest efforts in narrative that has ever been made. From beginning to end we have a vast history—in the original sense of the word which we usually denote by lopping the first syllable—flowing on in a perfectly unbroken stream, the thousand little rivulets that converge into the main flood neither neglected nor magnified into undue importance, but firmly and skilfully guided into their proper places as the component parts of a great whole. (Vol. i. pp. 179 and 180.)

Tennyson's work is described as

The most English of poetry, with the inspiration in it of the plains and low-lying levels, the rich and quiet fields, the midland country with Locksley Hall lying in the wide landscape of its meadows, and the problems of actual life and thought, replacing all tumults and commotions of a revolutionary age. (Vol. i. p. 213.)

"In Memoriam," says Mrs. Oliphant, is not an elegy like "Lycidas," nor a song of consolation ; "it is sorrow itself which takes the word, embodying as no poet had ever done before, the long discursive wanderings of melancholy thought, the mingled train of recollections" (p. 216). Several portraits of the great writers are powerfully drawn. Space will scarcely allow of further quotation, but we might refer the reader to that given of Carlyle and his wife in vol. i. p. 121 ; or of George Lewes reading the first part of the sad fortunes of the Reverend Amos Barton, in vol. ii. p. 168. After speaking of Ruskin's "wealth of beautiful writing," many passages from which "are quoted as we should frame and hang up a picture," Ruskin is

described as being “of the Boanerges order, an apostle of love, and full of the most amiable qualities, yet always ready to call down fire from heaven to consume those who follow another standard, or go by different rules from his.” (Vol. ii. p. 215.)

J. B. MILBURN.

Dictionnaire de la Bible. (Fascicule IV. Archéologie—Athènes). Paris: Letouzey et Ané.

ALITERATURE, vast in extent and revolutionary in character, has grown up within the present century, around the sacred books. New sources of knowledge have been opened up in Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt, bearing directly upon the historical books of the Old Testament. Year by year, too, we hear of the discovery of important writings of the early Church, supposed to have been long since lost to mankind, and throwing light upon the writings of the New Testament. Meanwhile, the sacred text is being subjected to the closest scrutiny and the most minute examination by hostile critics, who pretend to explain its origin on principles altogether different from those of Christian writers ; and who, whilst allowing that parts of it are deserving of the highest praise as being compositions of great merit, contend, on the other hand, that the Bible contains much of little or no value, and many passages indicating a very low and embryonic morality.

Under these circumstances Père Vigouroux has undertaken to edit a Bible Dictionary in which the Catholic student will find all the latest teaching of Catholic scholarship regarding Sacred Scripture. The work is thoroughly up to date. The names of the contributors are a sufficient guarantee of the value of the articles, which will treat of all subjects connected with the study of the Old and New Testaments. The latest attacks of destructive criticism upon the sacred books are examined and refuted, and information is afforded upon the latest discoveries in Egyptology, Assyriology, and kindred subjects. The present number contains, amongst other articles, interesting discussions on Biblical Archaeology, Assyria, and Assuérus.

To priests the work will be invaluable, containing, as it does, within a reasonable compass, the fruits of the labours of recent Biblical scholars. But it ought also to find a place in every Catholic library. In fact, every educated Catholic ought to endeavour to number this work amongst his books.

J. A. H.

The Microscope: its Construction and Management, &c. By Dr. HENRI VAN HEURCK. 4to, pp. 382. London: Crosswood, Lockley & Sons. New York: D. Van Nostrend & Co. Translated by WYNNE E. BAXTER, F.R.M.S., F.G.S. London: 1893.

THE English edition of this important work of Dr. Van Heurck, the distinguished botanist, and director of the Antwerp Botanical Gardens, is made from the fourth French edition, and must prove a most valuable addition to our literature upon the microscope. The text is accompanied by three plates and upwards of two hundred and fifty illustrations. After some general notions on optics, the learned author treats of Professor Abbe's theory of microscopical vision. Then he examines the various parts of the microscope, explains its use, and in a special chapter he deals with the important question of photo-micrography. Then comes a most useful chapter on the art of preparing microscopical objects. The general reader will be more especially interested by the part of this work which treats of the history of the microscope. When we reflect upon the immense importance to science and to philosophy of the invention of that marvellous instrument, we cannot but be struck with admiration and gratitude for the great men who have endowed modern science with such a means of investigation. The discovery of printing is commonly held to have been a most important turning-point in the progress of German learning. Yet, it may be questioned whether the microscope has not done still more for it. The whole gigantic advance made during the last hundred years in natural science is almost entirely due to the fact that we have been able to investigate living organisms as well as inorganic bodies by the help of the microscope, and our progress in those investigations has been entirely conditioned by the gradual improvements introduced by microscope constructors.

Ingenuity, among the ancients, had to take the place of direct observation for all in Nature that is not visible to the naked eye, and we now know that the most instructive and the most important facts in Nature are in the majority of cases outside the range of our unaided vision. From a passage in Seneca, we learn that the ancients were acquainted with the fact that a glass globe filled with water will magnify objects seen through it, but they were certainly unacquainted with glass lenses. It was only in 1285 that a Florentine, Salvino d'Aranato, invented the art of manufacturing glass spectacles. In the Palazzo Pitti, at Florence, there is an engraving made from a picture by Raphael, which represents Pope Leo X. in the act of examining a miniature with the assistance of a magnifying glass. But such a glass did not constitute a microscope.

This further discovery is due to Zacharias Janssen, a small optician of Middleburg. He really invented the compound microscope, probably about the year 1590.

After giving us a most interesting account of the successive improvements which in course of time followed the momentous discovery, Dr. Van Heurck adds some valuable considerations on the future of the microscope, based upon a technical analysis of great delicacy, which shows his intimate acquaintance with that difficult subject.

We conclude this brief notice by heartily commending Dr. Van Heurck's book, in its present dress, to English readers. The translation, a labour of some difficulty where a scientific work of this nature is concerned, appears to have been most successfully done, and reflects great credit upon Mr. W. E. Baxter, the translator.

Sound and Music. By the Rev. J. A. ZAHN, C.S.C., Professor of Physics in the University of Notre Dame. 8vo, pp. 452. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1892.

THIS valuable work represents the substance of a course of lectures given by the author in the Catholic University of America at Washington. Those lectures were intended to give musicians, and general readers also, an accurate knowledge of the principles of acoustics, together with a sufficient exposition of the physical basis of musical harmony. The book before us is therefore a really scientific work, but it is one in which the most delicate questions of physics are handled with such ability, and in so clear and agreeable a style, that it is entirely free from all dryness or obscurity, and will undoubtedly prove most fascinating reading even to those who have no previous acquaintance with the subject. The text is accompanied by numerous excellent illustrations, which, of course, largely help to make it easy and clear. Yet this work is anything but superficial in its treatment of the subject. It embodies all the important researches of Helmholtz, Koenig, and other masters in the science of acoustics, and formulates the latest discoveries in that science in a most scientific manner. Some chapters in which the great physiological questions raised by acoustics are stated and discussed will perhaps be read with even greater interest. Yet the learned author deals with those difficult and delicate matters in a spirit at once free from timidity and from unscientific assertions, such as becomes an educated Catholic who has in his faith a safe guide in all such obscure questions, and knows the limits which, in the nature of things, circumscribe the sphere of our intellectual

activity. As Fr. Zahn well says, for instance, when discussing the manner in which the human ear comes to realise sound as such,

When we can comprehend the nature of the link that binds mind and matter, then, and not till then, may we hope to have some insight into the nature of the phenomena here presented to us, to understand how motion can originate sensation, and how vibrations of different periods can be changed, translated, as it were, into what appears to our senses as heat, light, and sound.

Space will not allow us to make more quotations. Yet there is much in the book—for instance, respecting the relation between science and art—to which our readers' attention should be directed. It is this power of intermingling abstract scientific statements with higher philosophical and æsthetic considerations which renders Fr. Zahn's book so eminently readable, and will, we feel sure, much enlarge its sphere of usefulness. We rejoice at the same time to see in this valuable work another evidence of the intellectual activity of the Catholic University of Washington. It bears witness to the high standard the University expects of its lecturers, and it justifies a most sanguine view of the influence that such an educational institute must surely exercise upon the rising generation of Catholics in the United States.

B. K.

Mes Souvenirs sur Napoléon. Par le Comte CHAPTEL. Large 8vo, pp. 409–420. Paris : Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1893.

ARE we ever to arrive at a definite estimate of Napoleon's character? The good old-fashioned Corsican-ogre portrait has long been mouldering away in our cellars, having been replaced by a magnificent picture representing him as a superior kind of demigod. M. Taine has, however, given us a fresh study much on the lines of the earlier one, and painted with almost equally sombre colours. If we may accept the testimony of M. Chaptal, the latest published witness, this last portrait would seem to be the most faithful to the original. Few of Bonaparte's contemporaries were in a better position to tell us what manner of man he was. In the great work of reorganising France, accomplished with such marvellous skill during the short period of the Consulate, Chaptal was the First Consul's right hand, and although he resigned office at the beginning of the Empire he remained to the last on intimate terms with his master. Most of those who have undertaken to describe the mighty conqueror for us, have been either servile flatterers or spiteful enemies. Chaptal is far from belonging to either class, and hence his account is particularly valuable. He lays special stress on the fact that there were really two Napoleons, not contemporary

and entirely opposed to each other like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, but the one before 1804 and the other after that date, and both having much in common. As in most men's careers, the dividing line comes in at the end of the making of his fortune and at the beginning of his endeavours to keep it. In both periods, indeed, the good and the bad qualities were all on the heroic scale. The difference was that in the earlier period he recognised his dependence on others and therefore had greater consideration for them, whereas later on he looked upon all men as fools or tools. His complete absorption in self and utter want of regard for others overmastered him and became the chief cause of his fall. This distinction between the two portions of Bonaparte's career is not, however, the ground of the division of M. Chaptal's book. For this purpose he makes use of a distinction even more important, yet one which so many biographers entirely overlook. Bonaparte's opinions, carefully noted down by Chaptal, are carefully separated from Chaptal's opinion of Bonaparte. Thus we have a series of chapters containing Napoleon's views on the Revolution, on government, on war, on agriculture, on manufactures, on commerce, and on the arts. These are very valuable, most of them for their own sake, and all of them for the insight they give us into the character of the man who expressed them. On page 304 will be found a singular eulogy of Wellington.

There is a man for you [said the Emperor]; he is obliged to retreat before an army which he dares not encounter, but he takes care to make a desert of eighty leagues between the enemy and himself; he retards the advance of that army; he weakens it by privations of all kinds; he ruins it without fighting it. Only Wellington and I, in Europe at least, are capable of executing such measures. But there is this difference between him and me—that France would blame me, whereas England will praise him for what he has done.

After giving us these chapters, M. Chaptal goes on to tell us what he himself thinks of the great man. In reading this part I have been struck with the writer's cool and calm method of proceeding. There is no hacking or smashing here. The club and the hatchet are left to ruder performers. He reminds us rather of some skilful surgeon operating with professional deliberation on his subject, laying bare the various tissues and pointing out their structure and functions. And what an awful "subject" M. Chaptal has under his physiological dissecting-knife! Intelligence of the highest order, untiring physical energy, tremendous force of will, with hardly a spark of affection or a single generous impulse. Our friend the ogre gives us a very inadequate notion. There was no clumsy brute force about Bonaparte. Ahriman or Milton's Satan would be nearer the mark.

We are indebted to M. Chaptal's great-grandson, the Vicomte An. Chaptal, for the publication of this interesting volume. He has also given us some account of his ancestor's later career, and (what is rare in French books) he has added a full index.

T. B. S.

Le Maréchal Ney. 1815. Par HENRI WELSCHINGER. Large 8vo, pp. 428. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1893.

M. WELSCHINGER has already distinguished himself by able monographs on the execution of the Duke d'Enghien and on Napoleon's divorce. Having thus dealt with the two great blots of the Consulate and the Empire, he now turns to the famous case which is the reproach of the Restoration. That Ney "betrayed" the Bourbons is clear. That they were wrong in putting him to death is equally plain. The only real question at issue is as to whose shoulders the blame should rest upon. The common account attributes the marshal's execution to the rage of the Royalists against the one man who might have stopped the usurper's advance, and indeed had sworn to do so. But M. Welschinger will not allow this. According to him, the Prussians and the English—notably the Duke of Wellington—were the real authors of the crime; and his book thus becomes a violent tirade against the two hated foes of *la belle France*. In reviewing one of his former volumes I had occasion to remark that while his industry in collecting evidence and the charm of his style leave nothing to be desired, his power of coming to a right judgment is by no means great. The present work confirms me in this opinion. The story of the betrayal, the two trials, and the execution of "the bravest of the brave," is admirably told; but there is little to support the author's main contention. There is, of course, abundant evidence of the brutality of the Prussians and the insolence of the English. It may be true, too, that Wellington could have saved the marshal's life. But after all they only looked on approvingly while their dauntless adversary fell under the bullets of his own countrymen. One hundred and thirty-nine peers of France voted for his death. Only seventeen were in favour of the milder punishment of exile. It is surely vain for M. Welschinger to try to persuade us that all these great nobles were simply the tools of the implacable Allies.

One incident of the closing scene of Ney's career is worth recalling here. When he was told that he might see his confessor, he said: "Don't bother me about that." At these words one of the guards, a veteran non-commissioned officer, said respectfully: "You are wrong there, marshal. I am not as brave as you are, but I am just as old

a soldier, and I have always found that I can stand the fire best when I have made my peace with God." "Perhaps you're right," answered Ney, suddenly touched; "your advice is good." Then turning to the colonel, he asked: "What priest can I call?" "The Abbé de Pierre, curé of Saint Sulpice," was the reply. "Ask him to be good enough to come," said the marshal. For a full hour confessor and penitent remained alone together, and together they were driven to the place of execution.

T. B. S.

Apologetics, or Christianity Defensively Stated. By ALEXANDER BALMAIN BRUCE, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1892. xvi-522 pp. Price 10s. 6d.

WHILST not always perfectly satisfactory to a Catholic reader on account of the quarter whence it comes, still it is ever pleasant to find any attempt on the part of those separated from us to vindicate, if not the divine, at any rate the natural rights and inherent beauties of Christianity. It is with this modified pleasure that we open the book before us. Its value will lie outside Catholic sphere and influence, but even to us it will have its value in being able to gauge what is considered readable amongst those who represent a present-day form of Christian life in our midst, but yet apart from us.

We must, however, at once confess our pain at reading the following dreadful words on our Lord at p. 410:

With belief in the virgin birth is belief in the virgin life, as not less than the other a part of the veil that must be taken away that the true Jesus may be seen as He was—a morally defective man, better than most, but not perfectly good.

We apologise to our readers for having to make such a quotation, and we stand aghast at the effect upon other minds when asked on such grounds to believe in any Christ at all. We will still fondly hope that the taught can still teach the author.

In the matter of Agnosticism, the author is as pitifully unhappy. To quote his words from p. 162: "A man can be an Agnostic if he pleases. Faith in God is an affair of personal conviction. No offence is meant by this statement." The author may have many sound reasons for not asking to offend his readers, but it is some comfort that it has entered his mind as a possibility that such a thought might be possible to them. We would rather go further and ask what honour the author could think he was paying the God he is presumably defending against others who are attacking His own on earth, by words so absolutely calculated to help those who are ready

to accept the Gospel of doubt. To a Catholic such playing with Truth is so repulsive that he almost looks in vain for a way of hope into which to lead a soul not knowing how to understand the reason of the life above Nature.

Our readers have from two very sorry quotations seen ample and sufficient evidence of the value such a book as this is likely to be to them. If God Himself and His Divine Son are so lowered in the esteem of men as the quotations would lead us to suppose permitted, we can only conclude that we as Catholics can have less to say to the author who should know more and better than to those who may peruse this book hoping thereby to be able to assuage the violence of thoughts which suggest to them that God is neither their Creator nor their Redeemer. On opening the book, and in our first remarks upon it, we hoped for the sake of those who would be most likely to be its readers that a pleasure was in store for us as well as for them; but we lay it down with a feeling which can only be understood by one within the Fold of the Catholic Church. The book is otherwise well printed, and goes over much ground.

A Christian Apology. By PAUL SCHANZ, D.D., D.Ph., Professor of Theology in the University of Tübingen. Translated by Rev. MICHAEL F. GLANCEY and Rev. VICTOR SCHOBEL, D.D. Vols. I. and II., 1891; Vol. III., 1892. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. New York: Frederick Pustet.

IN a rash moment, the present writer accepted an invitation to review this translation of Dr. Schanz's work for the pages of this magazine. The fulfilment of the undertaking has been long delayed by the growing sense of the unsatisfactory character which must necessarily belong to the performance. To do anything like justice to a critical review of the book—and after all what is wanted is, we suppose, not a mere panegyric, but a genuine criticism, whose qualities may attract credit to the judgments uttered—appears to us a task not unlike that of writing a review of an encyclopædia. For the purview of sciences treated by Schanz in their bearings on Christianity is so wide, being indeed almost co-extensive with the entire scientific domain itself, that it is obvious that a critic, if he is to be competent, ought to be a proficient in each and every one of the branches of modern research, from molecular physics to Scriptural textual criticism. Now, we not only feel our own entire incompetence to pose as such a *fin-de-siècle* "Admirable Crichton," but we are really sceptical as to the existence of such a prodigy at all, and

still more as to the exact value attaching to his judgments, if he really do exist.

And this is not all. A further doubt crosses our mind: what about the author himself? He has set out to accomplish a task which we feel inclined to call Cyclopean—to erect a vast system of fortifications of the most recent and most approved scientific character around the entire region of Christian truth, natural, revealed, historical. He is to be the Vauban of the whole Christian religion. But is it possible for one man to accomplish such an undertaking at this dawn of the twentieth century? It is now between fifty and sixty years since Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman, whose gifted pen opened the first number of the DUBLIN REVIEW, delivered to a delighted audience in Rome his really remarkable series of "Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion." Even at this day, when science has made such gigantic strides since 1835, and when Wiseman's lectures are so thoroughly *passé*, it is impossible to read without fascination those wonderful essays in apologetics. One is amazed at the width and the depth of Wiseman's knowledge and culture. Physical and biological science, ethnology, comparative philology, archaeology, primitive history, exegetic and textual criticism of Scripture, heathen and Christian philosophy—all in turn are discussed with a wealth of learning and a sureness of grasp that fill us with astonishment, and illustrated with a facility of quotation from Oriental philology and literature that show us how genuine a scholar the author must have been. But more than half a century has passed since Wiseman's great achievement; and we strongly doubt whether there be any scholar, however sound and however widely read, who could with impunity undertake to repeat his great task. Achilles would nowadays be vulnerable in both heels, and in many another spot besides. Hence it was with some misgivings that we entered upon the study of this very imposing work, which the zeal and literary ability of the Revv. Father Glancey and Dr. Schobel have made accessible to English readers, in three volumes of a total of 1715 pages of close letterpress. Is it possible, is it prudent, for one man, however gifted, to attempt a work such as this? In order to give the reader some idea of the greatness of the undertaking, we purpose to describe the plan of the work. That plan is remarkable for its symmetry. It is tripartite, and to each of the three volumes is assigned one of the three divisions of the apology. The first, entitled "God and Nature," is of course concerned with physical, biological, and psychological science, and anthropology, and is a defence of natural religion. The second, styled "God and Revelation," is occupied with the compara-

tive history of religions and biblical criticism ; it is a general apology of Christianity. Whilst the third, under the name of "The Church," represents the *ark*, the innermost citadel of the fortification ; it is a detailed vindication from Scripture and history of the claims of the Catholic Church and of the See of Peter. We must now enter into somewhat fuller details of each of these three concentric lines of defence.

After preliminary chapters on the definition of Apologetics, the history of Apologetics, and the universality of "Religion" in its widest sense, the first volume proceeds to discuss the great primary questions involved in ontologism and traditionalism respectively ; the natural knowledge of a Supreme Being ; ideas, conscience, and kindred problems. Then we have the problems of the beginning of existence, and of the world, the whole system of cosmology. This leads up to the consideration of life, the organic and inorganic worlds and their differences ; spontaneous questions, the germ theory, evolution, the origin of species, Darwinism. The consideration of man and his characteristics forms the transition to a fresh examination of the old argument of "design and purpose ;" the questions connected with the human soul, virtue and reason ; then the discussion of the Monistic theory, the system of creation, the unity and age of the human race, concluding, as a corollary, with a chapter on the deluge.

Passing now to the second volume, of which the general title is "God and Revelation," we are introduced, after some preliminary remarks on the history of religions, to a detailed sketch of the chief non-Christian systems, ancient and modern. The Vedic religion of Ancient India, and its later developments, especially Buddhism ; the religion of the ancient Persians, or Mazdeism ; those of the Greeks, Romans, and Teutons ; of China and Japan ; of ancient Egypt, of Babylonia and Assyria, and finally of the pre-Islamic Arabs, are in turn passed in review from both the historic and dogmatic standpoints. Then follows a briefer *résumé* of the various "uncivilised" religious cults, particularly Fetishism, with some remarks on totemism and kindred subjects, and a hasty reference to the Shamanistic religion of the Mongols. All this is exceedingly interesting, and forms a suitable introduction to a more elaborate and erudite treatise on the religion of Israel in the light of modern science. The theories connected with the names of Graf and Wellhausen and their school receive a very full treatment, and the various difficulties raised by them are fairly stated and discussed. After some remarks on the subsequent developments of Judaism in the Talmudic and Kabbalistic schools, and a chapter on Islam, we are led on to the

all-important topic of the origins of Christianity; the relations between reason and revelation, miracles, prophecy, and the many questions connected with the authenticity and veracity of Holy Scripture, inspiration, and scriptural interpretation. Here we are met by the newest problems of the modern "critical" school, the origin of the Gospels, the "Mark hypothesis" connected with the name of Griesbach, the relations between the "Synoptics" and the "Fourth Gospel," and kindred topics. The volume concludes with chapters on the life of Jesus, the person and nature of Christ, His doctrine and work, and finally the crowning subject, His divinity.

From the "Christian Apology" of the second we pass to the more strictly "Catholic Apology" of the third and last volume, entitled: "The Church." Briefly stated, the topics herein discussed are the Church according to Holy Scripture; the marks of the church, treated in most elaborate detail; her apostolicity, according to the triple testimony of Holy Scripture, the fathers, and the early heretics; her unity; her catholicity; the note of infallibility, first, of the Apostles and the apostolic age, then the formal proof, and lastly the material proof of the Church's infallibility throughout the ages; the necessity of the Church for salvation; the holiness of the Church; Scripture and Tradition; the primacy of Peter; the primacy of the Pope; his infallibility. Finally, a concluding chapter on "Christianity and Civilisation" worthily completes the whole.

Such is the sumptuous intellectual bill of fare provided for his readers by the theologian of Tübingen; and nobody can dispute either the completeness of the programme or the perfect symmetry of its arrangement, whilst the interest of such a noble presentment of the entire system of the truth is of the most absorbing character. But what a daring man, one is led to exclaim, must he be who undertakes single-handed to construct, in the face of all the weapons of precision of the most modern science and the most advanced criticism, so vast a system of apology and defence! And consequently how daring, too, must be the critic who would profess to sit in judgment upon such a performance! Yet, unfortunately, we have undertaken the task, and must perforce do our best to offer at least as fair and impartial an opinion as we are qualified to form, and try to distinguish the part of the honest critic from that of the mere panegyrist.

And first of all, let us say, that whilst the foregoing bare enumeration shows the very wide field traversed by Dr. Schanz, the reader cannot but admire the thoroughness with which he enters successively into each of the scientific problems discussed, involving, as they do, every one of the exact and natural sciences. He shows evidence of careful and minute study, and his quotations alone prove how

anxious he has been to keep himself well up to date in the specialistic literature of each branch. Above all, he is evidently not afraid of reading and pondering for himself the writings of adversaries, so as to know them first hand. All this gives to his treatment of many topics, otherwise trite in "the Schools," a surprising freshness, that to some readers may even appear a little startling, but to many more, we hope, will be as gratifying as it is astonishing.

Again, it is but just to acknowledge the great interest we have felt in perusing the successive chapters of the book, and the large amount of information, often of a most striking kind, we have derived from it, and to admire the acuteness and clearness of perception with which the various hypotheses of science are scrutinised by Dr. Schanz, whose acquaintance with all the schools of modern thinkers and investigators is evidently so extensive.*

If, on the other hand, we are asked whether, in our humble opinion, the learned author has succeeded in carrying through his gigantic task with such success as to be beyond the reach of criticism, we feel bound to confess that, wonderfully able as the performance is, it still seems to underlie certain weaknesses upon which it is our duty to remark. Generally speaking, we have been rather unfavourably impressed with a certain "nebulosity" of style, which seems characteristic of Dr. Schanz—as, indeed, it so often is of German thinkers. That this is not merely attributable to our insular dulness of apprehension, is, we think, rendered probable by the fact that we have found the opinion shared by more than one reader of conspicuous ability.

The effect of this nebulosity (it is not easy to find another word) is to render it often difficult to follow the line of the learned professor's argumentation, with the occasional alarming result that his adversaries' objections sometimes seem clearer and easier to apprehend than his own answers to them. We think we have noticed this several times in his treatment of modern rationalistic schools of Scriptural criticism, whether it be in discussing Wellhausen, or Kuene's views on the composition of the Old Testament, or Griesbach's hypotheses concerning the New. Let us hasten to add that this result is nowise attributable to the two able translators; they have done their part admirably, their work has a genuine English, often Shakespearean, ring, which occasionally deserves to be called racy. The fault, we fear, is in the author.

* We are, however, greatly disappointed to find a writer of so much breadth of view entirely neglecting, in his account of modern Italian apologists (vol. i. p. 63), the greatest name of all—that of the illustrious philosopher of Rovereto and his school—this omission of Rosmini, and of such an eminent savant as Stoppani, being really unpardonable.

When we descend from general style to particulars of scientific argument, we are met with the consciousness that it would ill become us, after what has been said in the beginning, were we to attempt anything like a critical examination of so wide a field of science, all the more so as such a proceeding would imply a familiarity with the exact and physical sciences to which we have no claim at all. It may, however, be permitted us to briefly notice one or two points which have struck us as lending themselves to exception or remark. For instance, it may possibly be but an inaccuracy of expression, but we cannot but feel surprised to find on p. 127, the statement that "in every steam-engine a great deal of energy is *lost*, and a residue of heat remains." It is surely impossible after the discoveries of the late J. P. Joule, to speak, at least in the strict sense, of the "loss" of heat, or, indeed, of any other natural force. Again, there seems to be considerable confusion, if not worse, in the zoological statements on p. 178. We are told that the "ant-bear is the only mammal at present known to lay eggs." This is inaccurate. Two mammals are known to lay eggs—viz., the Australian *ornithorhynchus*, or duck-billed platypus, and the *echidna* of the same continent. Neither of these is an ant-eater, nor indeed do they belong, as the passage seems to imply, to the order of edentata (in which the ant-eaters are classed), but together form an altogether distinct sub-class of mammalia, widely distinct from all other known mammals, even from the marsupialia, and known as "ornithodelphia." This sub-class it is (as the name indicates), and *not* the "scaly *ant*-eater," as stated by Schanz, that "supplies the missing link between mammals and birds."*

Still more surprising is the statement (p. 406) that the whole Aryan family before its dispersal probably "led a peaceful life at the foot of the Himalayas." Surely such a theory has never been broached by any savant! The ordinarily accepted belief is that some part of Central Asia, perhaps near the Pamir, was the "cradle-land" of our Aryan ancestors—although, it is true, the most fashionable hypothesis of late has been to fix that primeval home in Northern Europe or the Russian steppes; but the foot of the Himalayas could imply nothing else than either Northern India or the Tibetan Plateau.

It is, however, when we turn to that department of science of which we may profess ourselves to have made more particular study, that we find most reason to be dissatisfied with Dr. Schanz's performance; we refer to the comparative history of religion. Having said

* St. George Mivart, "Types of Animal Life," pp. 50-62, may be profitably consulted on this point.

this much, we are bound to substantiate our criticism. The chapters at least on the Indian and Eranian religions sadly need revising. On p. 33 there is an awkward confusion of the goddess Vak (Vac) with Vatu, the wind, that should never have been allowed to pass. The statement (p. 30) that "the root *dyn* is found only in Sanscrit as the name for God. All the Indo-European languages have this word, and no other, for God," is both self-contradictory and incorrect in both its parts; for the Teutonic *Tyu* as a divine name disproves the first sentence, and the entire absence of a name for God derived from the same root in the Persian languages disproves the second. The Hindu religion cannot be justly styled "the most advanced" (p. 25) of the Indo-European cults, in face of the more perfect form of that of the Avesta; nor can it be broadly asserted that Brahmanism resolved itself into "the belief in an absolute *personal* Being" (p. 35). We think "impersonal" would have been the more appropriate word. It is hardly serious, surely, to attribute the *Atharva Veda* to "the eleventh century" (presumably B.C., p. 26).

In the account of the Avestic religion, we are surprised to meet again with the now discredited hypothesis that the "schism" which separated the ancestors of Hindus and Eranians was of a religious nature, that it occurred in India(!), and that "the Iranians went forth from India during the Vedic period"(!), when "the old plain form of the Vedas began to be cast off" (p. 58). Not only is this theory of the "schism" abandoned by orientalists, but the implied comparison of the Vedas and the Avesta is inaccurate; very much of the Vedas is highly artificial and of late date, while much of the Avesta compares favourably with the Vedic hymns, as regards both antiquity and "simplicity." It is unsatisfactory, too, that we find no account of the Old Persian religion of the Achæmenid inscriptions, which must by no means be identified *en bloc* with that of the Avesta. Once more, it is scarcely correct to say that "according to the Parsee Zend-Avesta the world was created in six periods, and each period lasted a year" (p. 353). It is true that this statement is found in the (much later) Pehlevi work, the *Bundehesh*, and that it probably is based upon traditions of great antiquity, and even professes to be taken from "revelation"—i.e., the Avesta. Still, as the Avesta now exists, the statement is nowhere to be found in it. Nor can we accept Dr. Schanz's assertion (p. 309) regarding the principles of good and evil, that "a common beginning and end is recognised even by the Iranian religion, the mother of dualism." At least, as thus stated, the assertion is too broad. Philosophical exigency eventually drove the Eranian thinkers to excogitate some theory to escape from the inherent self-contradiction of the Avestic

dualism, and under the Sassanids the solution stated above was that adopted by the very important school of the Zervanists; but it will hardly do to set it down as the general teaching of the Mazdayasnian religion. We could add other such criticisms, but we forbear.

A word must really be said of the too abundant misprints scattered through the work, and which in a scientific treatise of such pretensions are a more serious blemish than they would be elsewhere.

It is provoking enough to an English reader to find the oriental proper names all rendered in the clumsy German transliteration of the original, instead of the simpler forms to which we are accustomed in this country—*e.g.*, Tshandra, Aditijas, Surja, Vaisja, Jazeta, Chadidscha, &c., instead of Chandra, Adityas, Surya, Vaisya, Yazata, Khadija, &c.; but these after all are faults of the translators, whilst certain mis-spellings are such as seem to belong rather to the author himself—*e.g.*, Asrinas for Asvinas, Dyupater, Rayha for Raghā, Yasadhora for Yasodhara, &c.* But two errors we have met which suggest incorrectness of information rather than mere carelessness of proof-reading: for what are we to say to such a slip as “Sunneric” for Sumeric (in both vols. i. and ii), or still more to the inexplicable use of “*pike-villages*” for “*pile-villages*” throughout chap. xviii. of the first volume?

There are far too many of these slips. Again, what are we to think of the statement that the Parsees in India number “several hundred thousands,” when the last census gave only 89,904? or how shall we reconcile the estimate of “7,000,000” as the total number of Buddhists (vol. ii. p. 23) with the exaggerated statement, in the opposite extreme, that they number “several hundred millions” (vol. i. p. 295)?

We hope these criticisms may be taken in good part, as they are intended. We have no desire to appear hyper-critical, and have indeed passed over many items of comment which we had marked. But a work of this kind challenges by its very nature the most careful scrutiny, and this scrutiny in turn is often the truest kindness to an author. Let us hope that this important work may live to see a further edition, in which most, if not all, of these inaccuracies, chiefly of detail, may be remedied.

But one omission there is for which we can find neither palliation nor excuse, and honesty compels us to utter our protest against what

* A curious complex blunder is that on p. 44, vol. ii., in the not very critical account of Buddhism, where one of the best-known and most eminent Buddhist scholars is referred to as Bishop Bigandet, Vicar-Apostolic of Ava and Peru (!). It is true that Bishop Bigandet was formerly Vicar-Apostolic of Ava and Pegu, but for many years his Vicariate has been entitled that of Western Burma.

is nowadays the one unpardonable sin in every scientific work—the entire absence of an index! The translators plead the great growth of matter in the last volume as an excuse. Why not, then, a small supplementary volume?

We should do ill to end without a few words of congratulation to the indefatigable translators on their completion of so extensive and so difficult an undertaking, in which they frequently show great acumen and clearness of judgment, even occasionally correcting or supplementing their author; and also some expression of regret at the far too long delay which, owing to a variety of reasons, has occurred in our notice of their performance, and which, we are sure, must have been a sore trial to their patience and good-nature.

The Vatican and the Kingdom of Italy. By the Very Rev. L. MAGLIONE, Canon of the Diocese of Salford. 8vo, pp. 148. London: Burns & Oates. 1s.

THIS pamphlet embodies a series of letters written by Canon Maghone in defence of the Temporal Power, and published in the *Manchester Guardian* in reply to Cavaliere Froelich, Italian consul in Manchester. The scope of the work cannot be better described than in the words in which the author concludes his preface. "My only desire is to publish facts in proof of my statement that the subversion of the Temporal Power of the Pope is an act of spoliation, a fraud, and a sacrilege, perpetrated, not by the will of the Italian people, but by intrigues and armed conspiracy fomented by the House of Savoy, backed by ambitious politicians and interested adventurers." In his opening chapter, Canon Maglione traces the origin of the Temporal Power. In doing so, he very truly points out that the permanence by which it survived so many less enduring institutions was due to its connection with a motive that is and must be as permanent as Catholicism itself—the desire to secure the liberty and independence of the Sovereign Ruler of the Church. It is at this point that the author touches that kernel of the whole question which so many writers upon the subject wisely or unwisely leave undiscussed—the question of international rights. It is not for us to say how far the ground taken up may or may not be tenable, but at all events it is clear and tangible. It is expressed in these words:

"In what way can the Roman State endanger the peace of the world? By attacking the Government at its head, a Government elected by the whole of the Catholic world; by Italy, Spain, France, Portugal, Austria, and one which it is duly bound to defend and

preserve. Hence, it follows that if the Roman State rises against the Government for which it exists, it is brought face to face, not with one or two foreign powers, but with all the Catholic powers, who will remind the Roman State of its duty in the name of certain rights which are superior to its own, because of longer standing and of general interests, whereas its own are put forward on behalf of individuals. Moreover, the said rights being backed by superior force, cannot fail to be irresistible. In a word, the sovereignty of the Catholic nations is, in this case, superior to the Sovereignty of the Roman people."

Putting aside the argument of the backing of "superior force" which is not a particularly a strong one, and which for the present, at all events, seems to have worked the other way, it is clear that the passage cited enunciates certain very important and interesting principles, which it concerns all true defenders of the Temporal Power to learn by heart and to analyse in doing so. First of all, it assumes the cardinal principle that the rights of any part of the European community are to be exercised only in a manner which is conformable to the interests of that community as a whole. Secondly, it would maintain that this eminent domain of the whole over the part may go so far as to perpetually fix upon that part a given rulership and form of government, as often and as long as the interest of the whole may require it. Thirdly, as a matter of fact and application, it contends that this community of interest exists in the advantages of the territorial independence of the Holy See, and therefore requires that the Roman State, as a duty to Catholic Europe, shall have for its government the Papacy and no other.

Herein the author constructs us a plain and rational platform on which to take his stand—worth just a world of rhetoric and recrimination!—and provided its two supports (the principle of the subordination of national to international interests, and the fact of territorial princedom being an essential of Papal independence) hold firm, he need have no fear whatever that his position will be less than impregnable. It would be idle to contend that the conclusion, however devoutly to be cherished, can ever be stronger than the principle and the fact that make up its premisses, and one can hardly resist the impression that time and effort would be much more wisely concentrated upon enforcing their cogency than upon any general indictments of fraud and spoliation against the House of Savoy. No doubt the latter is an important element in the case, and Canon Maglione, replying to an opponent who would cast the glamour of enthusiasm over a very wide area of accomplished facts, could not easily abstain from the *rôle* of a fearless realist in sketching the

political evolution in Italy. It is a work which a defender of the Temporal Power, in such a juncture, can hardly leave undone, and if it is to be done at all, perhaps it is just as well that it should be done *con amore* and with that earnestness which is displayed on every page of this pamphlet. Not the less, we submit that the strongest part of our brief is not there, but rather in those primary principles by which, after all, national destinies are directed and institutions stand or fall in the logic of history. Fraud, falsehood, robbery, usurpation, sacrilege, conspiracy, and crime, are seven devils that are always at work in any great movement or convulsion of human nature—even before 1789!—and there cannot be the least doubt that they were all very much to the front in the “making of Italy.” But the mere fact of their presence—if we wish to convince others than ourselves—can never be our palmary argument. There are conscientious Unionists, we suppose, who are not one whit the less honestly convinced of the excellence and necessity of the Union, because they are made aware of the “blackguardism” by which, under Pitt and Castlereagh, the work was consummated. They feel that in the long run principles, not facts, are the arbiters of national issues, and console themselves in remembering the French adage that omelettes cannot be made without the breaking of eggs. We fear that philosophy of that kind has a strong hold upon the minds of those whom this pamphlet is designed to enlighten in our utilitarian age. In point of fact, Europe goes on merrily making her omelettes and priding herself on their flavour, and enjoys them not one degree the less because cooks like Cavour or Mazzini and Garibaldi have roughly and ruthlessly crushed the egg-shells in making them. It will be quite another matter, if we can show that the Italian omelette is indigestible or unwholesome, or poisonous, and likely to make Europe very sick indeed if she persists in having it. She is a selfish practical creature, who listens with a merely academic interest when people speak to her of the past, but wakes up and shows herself keenly alive to whatever affects her comfort and happiness in the future. If our mission is to move minds we had far better make our appeal where it is likely to be heard with attention. If we venture thus to emphasise the importance of a future-facing line of defence of the Temporal Power, it is with no wish whatever to discount the value or force of the realistic evidence that Canon Maglione has skilfully arrayed in his pages. As a work of zeal his pamphlet cannot be too highly commended. We hope that he may be induced to follow up the present, by a further contribution to the problem, one in which released from the need of pursuing a somewhat mobile controversial opponent he will be free to deal

more at length with the *de jure* side of the question, and to set forth in the light of economic principles, the relation of the Temporal Power to the modern evolution of constitutional and representative methods which have come to stay, and which, for good or for evil, are bound to shape modern national life both in the new world and in the old.

A Catholic Dictionary. By W. E. ADDIS and T. ARNOLD, M.A. New edition, revised and enlarged, with the assistance of the Rev. T. B. SCANNELL, B.D. Large 8vo, pp. 960. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

CATHOLIC readers will welcome the appearance of a fourth edition of this necessary work, and all the more cordially that it has passed through the revising hands of Father Scannell. Articles formerly in the Appendix have found their way into the body of the work; new articles have been added, and statistics have been brought up to date. Every one will feel that it is an advantage that Catholic households should be able to possess a single-volume work of reference to which they may turn for reliable information on matters of Catholic faith and practice. Such a desideratum is fairly met and supplied by the present work, and all true friends of the faith will feel grateful for the spirit of moderation and critical accuracy which runs through its articles. But when we pass from the Catholic general reader and come to think of what Catholic students and writers need in these days of research, we recognise in the work before us little more than a suggestion of what we ought to possess. The day has long since passed over when dictionaries of the encyclopaedic kind can be written by any small number of individuals. The encyclopaedic individual mind is deservedly regarded as a chimæra. When men in these days turn to such a publication for information and data they want to hear all that a live specialist thoroughly well up to date has to say upon each subject. It is only by the system of editorial bodies and the wide distribution of the articles, placing each into the hands of such specialist and recognised authorities that there can be compiled those works of ordnance which will be to us what Smith's Dictionaries are to the non-Catholic, and what Chambers or the "Encyclopædia Britannica" are to the nation. We say so much rather to indicate a need, keenly felt and still unsupplied, than to discount for a moment the value of the present Dictionary, which fulfils excellently well the popular scope for which it is intended. In its revised form we feel assured that it will meet with a still larger measure of well-deserved success at the hands of the Catholic public.

The Great Enigma. By W. S. LILLY. 8vo, pp. liv-320. London : John Murray. 1892.

THIS book—the author tells us in a dedicatory letter to Viscount Halifax—is “of the nature of an *argumentum ad hominem*, addressed to a class of readers practically outside the Christian pale.” It is an inquiry, from their point of view, into the tenableness of Christianity, into the truth or untruth of Christ’s Divinity.

Mr. Lilly has marshalled together a number of facts and arguments in support of his thesis. Their cumulative force is certainly considerable, yet we think that many might have been presented, not, indeed, in a more elegant, but in a more telling and convincing manner. Every fresh chapter we read seemed to confirm more strongly the opinion we formed when perusing the first—viz., that the work gives proof rather of an extensive reading than a profound reasoning, and shows its strength in historical rather than in philosophical treatment. We listen to the author most willingly when quoting from his rich repertory of sources. In fact, we sometimes feel that the best, pithiest, and most pungent sayings are culled from the works of others, yet they are so skilfully chosen and so deftly woven into the texture of the book that the general result is unquestionably pleasant and profitable. We are not sure that the author does not suffer to some extent in the estimation of the reader by a certain mannerism which at first sight looks very much like self-consciousness. After some well-deserved criticisms passed upon Mr. Spencer’s “Scientific Agnosticism,” we found the following :

“I am unfeignedly sorry to be obliged to offend these little ones who believe in Mr. Spencer. In truth I may claim to some fellow feeling with them. For, if Mr. Spencer will permit me to say so, I regard him with much admiration, sincere respect, and lively gratitude, profoundly as I differ from him, &c.”

Again, “A suggestion of mine was the immediate occasion of Cardinal Newman’s writing on the Inspiration of Scripture,” and “it is within my personal knowledge that nothing which ever proceeded from the pen of my venerated friend was more carefully considered.”

But these are after all small blemishes in a book at once interesting and instructive.

There are many points, some touched upon merely incidentally, concerning which we differ *toto cælo* from the learned author. We cannot, for instance, share his desire to save the National Church from its threatened disestablishment, nor should we regard the consequences of such a movement at all opposed to the general welfare of the true Church in this land. So again, Mr. Lilly’s account of

M. Renan, though extremely entertaining and curious, seems to us altogether too glowing.

But let us give some account of the book :

It is divided into seven chapters—viz.: 1. “The Twilight of the Gods,” in which the general groundwork of religious belief is made the subject of some inquiry. 2. “Atheism,” in which the propagation of that form of unbelief is to some extent traced out and accounted for; and the modern tendencies to substitute a crude philosophy for Christianity and religion is pointed out, with special reference to England, Germany, and France. M. Monteil is the principal representative of the school, and he takes a very optimist view of human nature. “Let man be of good cheer: let him know that human nature is essentially good, that man unspoilt by religion is just, loving, and lovable, whatever the phenomena of life may seem to teach to the contrary” (p. 65).

Chapter 3 is on “Critical Agnosticism.” M. Renan is selected as the best possible illustration of this school, and his whole career is briefly sketched for the benefit of the reader, and the trials of his mind and conscience reverently inquired into. “He interested, amused, fascinated his generation, much as Voltaire interested, amused, fascinated the generation which preceded the French Revolution. We may say that in him his countrymen had another and a better Voltaire. . . . ‘La vie est un enfant qu’il faut bercer jusqu’à ce qu’il s’endort’ sums up,” says Mr. Lilly, “the life philosophy of both.”

Chapter 4, on “Scientific Agnosticism,” of which Mr. Herbert Spencer is taken as the ablest exponent, covers some eighty or eighty-five pages. His system of philosophy, based for the most part upon the distinction between the knowable and the unknowable, is here submitted to a searching cross-examination and shown incapable of providing any satisfactory answer to the great enigma. It would be impossible to give a synopsis of this lengthy chapter, or to take note of the many points of conflict. Those, however, who are familiar with Mr. Spencer’s voluminous writings will scarcely need to be told where his teaching is at variance with sound Catholic faith.

“Life, according to Mr. Spencer, is ‘adequately conceived only when we think of it as the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations.’ Is life really no more than that? Does this decomposition really explain the man? How is it that I know aught external at all? Without the oneness, continuity, and identity of the thinking subject, it would be impossible to unite the elements of sensible knowledge: ‘to grasp together the manifold of intuition into the unity of apprehension;’ as Kant speaks. The

very condition of knowledge is the simplicity and persistence of the *ego*" (p. 145). Mr. Lilly assures us that "Mr. Spencer does not seem to possess even a rudimentary knowledge of the value of evidence and the nature of proof" (p. 147).

Nor is this all. "Mr. Spencer does not recognise the faculty of intuition. In truth, it is incompatible with his doctrine of The Unknowable. The primordial verities which it reveals to us he explains as lapsed sensations, as experiences of the race transmitted from age to age by heredity in organic form to the individual. He does not appear so much as to understand what metaphysicians mean when they speak of *à priori*, of 'ideals,' of 'laws of thought.' He exhibits no acquaintance with the philosophical import of the word 'necessity'" (p. 154). "His psychology" in fact is, in Mr. Lilly's phraseology, "but physiology thinly disguised in a few metaphysical rags and tatters. Yet, with all his parade of physical science, his system is not really founded upon experience at all" (p. 155).

Chapter 5 deals with "Rational Theism," and the inquiry whether Theism is, in fact, so hopelessly discredited as is frequently and confidently alleged. This is a very practical and important chapter, as the common arguments urged against Theism are first considered, examined, and found to be absolutely wanting, and then the grounds for belief in a personal God are clearly indicated and shown to be grounds "afforded by reason freely exercised according to the methods specially prized in these days."

Chapters 6 and 7 styled respectively "The Inner Light," and "The Christian Synthesis," lead us to the more constructive portion of Mr. Lilly's book. The contention in the seventh or last chapter is, to use the author's own words, "That while no one pretends that Christianity offers us a complete explanation of the scheme of things, there is no more reason in the nineteenth century than there was in the first, why its message should not be received by cultivated and intelligent men who feel their need of it, and who will carefully and candidly examine its claims for themselves. We may call Christianity, if we will, a chapel in the infinite. Still, it is a sacred shrine where life and death are transfigured for us, where we may gaze into the eternal realms of Spirit and Deity, where wise and learned, foolish and ignorant alike, may handle everlasting realities, and realise in their deepest experience, the powers of the world to come."

François Bacon. Par GEORGES L. FONSEGRIVE. 8vo, pp. 420. Paris: Lethielleux. 1893. 3fr. 50c.

FRENCH writers have always been famed for producing clear, concise, and interesting manuals. M. Fonsegrive's volume on Bacon is an excellent specimen of this style of work. Although the extent of his reading is vast, yet he never parades it ostentatiously nor overwhelms us with a mass of quotations. The arrangement of his materials is orderly, his exposition lucid, his judgment calm and unbiassed. If he has to find fault with his subject or with those who have written about him, he does so in a way that excites no animosity.

An exhaustive analysis and a copious index add much to the usefulness of his monograph. After a brief account of Bacon's chequered career, he passes on at once to state and develop the leading idea of the Baconian philosophy: "The true and legitimate object of the sciences is none other than the endowment of human life, with new inventions and new wealth" (*Nov. Org.*, i. 82). This much is by way of introduction. Then comes the main portion of the volume, divided into three books. The first of these gives an account of Bacon's attacks on his predecessors, and points out how unwarranted many of them are. Next we have an exposition and criticism of his system—his classification of the sciences, his methodology, his metaphysic, his scientific work, and his ethical and political principles. Lastly, there is a discussion as to the influence actually exercised by Bacon on the advancement of the sciences and on the course of thought during the last three centuries. Most of the material dealt with is of course familiar enough to English readers of philosophy, but we can, nevertheless, admire the literary skill with which it is set forth. Two portions, however, are specially noteworthy; the defence of the Schoolmen (pp. 95–119), and the account of Bacon's influence on the *philosophes* of the eighteenth century (pp. 320–331). Voltaire and the Encyclopædistes looked upon him as their parent, and the Convention ordered his works to be translated and printed at the public expense. This is the reason why De Maistre singled him out for a fierce onslaught. M. Fonsegrive, while disapproving of the violence of the doughty champion of the Catholic re-action, is of opinion that his strictures are now generally held to be justified. As to the other point—the defence of the Schoolmen, the following extract deserves to be quoted:

We may grant that from his utilitarian point of view Bacon had some reason for reproaching Aristotle and his successors for preferring theory to practice, contemplation to action, science to usefulness. But Bacon

was not justified in saying that Aristotle and his successors knew nothing of experience or induction; he was wrong in saying that since the time of the Greeks there had been no inventions, that neither the sciences nor the arts had made any progress, and that nothing had been done but to repeat stupidly the idle trash of the ancients. To be just, he should have borne in mind that the Middle Ages had the gigantic task of reducing the barbarians to Romano-Christian civilisation, of defending Europe against the inroads of the Mussulmans, of forming laws. Not content with performing this task, the Middle Ages preserved, by the pen of the monks, the literary and scientific treasures of antiquity; by the trowel of architects and the chisel of sculptors they covered Europe with magnificent civil and religious monuments; by the tongue and pen of great doctors they assimilated and developed the scientific patrimony handed down by the ancients, they laid up vast stores of materials for future inquirers, and prepared the way for modern science. Justice demands that all this should not be forgotten, and surely this would be enough for the glory of the Middle Ages. But Bacon could not be just. The Middle Ages had cultivated metaphysics and speculative science, and this, in his eyes, was the head and front of their offending. Their labours appeared to him to be contaminated in their very source. He condemned them all *en bloc* and without examining into them. He aimed at nothing less than destroying the very spirit which animated that epoch. He could not be just—revolutionists never are—because violence and passion are opposed to justice and because revolutions cannot be carried on without passion and violence (pp. 119–120).

T. B. SCANNELL.

Bernardin de St. Pierre. By ARVÈDE BARINE. Translated by J. E. GORDON. With a Preface by AUGUSTINE BIRRELL. 8vo, pp. xviii–409. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1893. (The Great French Writers).

WHEN Sainte-Beuve, the prince of French critics, calls “Paul and Virginia” “an adorable book,” and when a grim Scotchman like Carlyle speaks of it as “the swan-song of old dying France,” we must recognise that its author has a right to a place among the great writers of his country. The French people themselves have long decided in his favour. At the same time the story on which his fame rests does not count many English readers. We prefer our own Robinson Crusoe to the French imitation. The loves of Paul and Virginia, their sentimental talks about nature and virtue and Providence, do not appeal to us in the same way as the manly self-reliance and fertile resource of Defoe’s hero. St. Pierre’s larger work “*Études de la Nature*” (of which indeed “Paul and Virginia” is an episode, or rather a practical application) was meant by its author to be a grave work on the philosophy of “nature,” and a defence of Providence. Its real value lies in its vivid descriptions of scenery. Before he wrote, the French tongue was singularly poor in terms

capable of depicting nature. To him, more even than to Rousseau, is due the honour of having begun the work of enriching the language, which was one of the glories of the Romantic School. "Without the 'Études de la Nature,' not only 'René' and 'Atala,' 'Jocelyn' and 'Graziella,' but the 'Génie du Christianisme' and the 'Méditations,' would have been different from what they are." And his influence may be clearly traced in the living landscapes of the "Pêcheur d'Islande."

It does not become a foreigner to set himself in judgment on an eminent French critic writing on one of the classic authors of his country. I may say, however, that M. Barine's volume is admirable in every respect, and is well worthy of a place in the excellent series to which it belongs. Even in its English dress we can appreciate the charm and the skill of the original. Something must necessarily be lost in the translation of such artistic work; but on the whole Mr. Gordon is to be congratulated on the way that he has performed his difficult task. Now and then an "en" or "on" is not very smoothly rendered, and, though the French equivalent is feminine, Providence ought surely not to be spoken of as "she" and "her." And why is Virgil's epic called the "Eniad"? Mr. Augustine Birrell's preface is characterised by his usual dash of cynical humour. As it only serves to damp the reader's enthusiasm it should be read after M. Barine's little book, or, better still, omitted altogether.

T. B. S.

Histoire du Pape Etienne X. (Pape Belge). Bruxelles: Société Belge de Librairie.

WE see by the glorious pontificate of Leo XIII., happily reigning, how intimately the life and influence of any Pope are interwoven with contemporary history and the life of nations. The pamphlet before us is another illustration of this important truth. We owe, therefore, a debt of gratitude to M. Ulysse Robert for this short sketch of the life of Stephen X., which is an important contribution to the history of the eleventh century. Stephen X. received in baptism the name of Frederic. He was educated at the famous school of St. Lambert, Liège, of which cathedral he became a canon and archdeacon. From St. Lambert's he went to St. Peter's chair, which he occupied seven months and twenty-nine days. He is spoken of in his epitaph as "Sanctitate et miraculorum gloria illustris." For an appendix to his pamphlet M. Robert gives the

text of All Stephen's Buls. Belgium has given few Popes to the Church, and cannot afford to allow their memory to die out, especially as the halo of sanctity and learning adorns the head of the illustrious Stephen X.

Auguste Comte, Fondateur du Positivisme. Sa Vie : Sa Doctrine. Par le R. P. GRUBER, S.J. Traduit de l'allemand par l'Abbé MAZOYER. 8vo, pp. xviii-321. Avec une Préface par M. OLLÉ-LAPRUNE. Paris: Lethielleux. 1892 (3fcs. 50c.).

ALTHOUGH the English reader is especially well placed for studying Comte's life and writings, nevertheless the Catholic reader has felt the want of some concise account of them looked at from a Catholic point of view. Those who were able to read German hailed with great satisfaction the appearance of Father Gruber's monograph on Comte. Thanks to the Abbé Mazoyer the wider class of readers familiar with French can now enjoy the benefit of the learned Jesuit's labours. The translation has been executed under the author's supervision, and may therefore be taken as an accurate expression of his views. The French edition also has the advantage of an excellent introduction from the able pen of M. Ollé-Lapruné.

T. B. S.

Cambridge Historical Essays. No. VI. The Somerset Religious Houses. By W. A. J. ARCHBOLD, B.A., LL.B. Prince Consort Dissertation. 1890. 8vo, pp. 407. Cambridge: At the University Press.

THIS volume is, if we may be permitted to say so, a work of much promise, and highly creditable to Mr. Archbold. It is true it does not contain very much that is new; but, on the other hand, it gives evidence of a wide acquaintance with the literature dealing with the history of the Church of England during the Reformation period, and especially with the subject of the dissolution of the monasteries. Mr. Archbold has not, however, confined his researches to the pages of works already published; he has, to some extent, drawn from hitherto-unpublished sources, and has enriched his work with copies of many letters and other documents illustrative of the subject.

We are glad to see that Mr. Archbold—no doubt as the result of independent study—is at one with Father Gasquet and other recent writers upon the iniquity of the manner in which the destruction of

the religious houses was brought about. Of the visitors who were sent to inquire into the state of the monasteries he uses such adjectives as "vile" and "untrustworthy"; as to the motives for the suppression, he thinks they were by no means merely a wish for reform; in fact, the visitors were sent to the monasteries, not to inquire into the state of discipline, but "to secure the suppression." Still, it must be added, that though Mr. Archbold is not in sympathy with the way in which the suppression was carried out, he is clearly of opinion that the time had come for the abolition of the old monastic system, and that on the whole the suppression was an advantage to the nation.

We do not propose to enter upon a detailed criticism of the book, which, we may say, contains a good deal of useful and interesting information. Much is said in defence of the charity and hospitality practised by the monks, though the author does not think that the poverty and distress that arose about the time of the suppression were due to the disappearance of the religious houses. To some extent no doubt they were; but he attributes them more largely to social and economic changes involved in the gradual downfall of the feudal system. Mr. Archbold has a word to say on the part taken by the monasteries in the work of education, and here, too, he is a sympathetic critic. The knowledge imparted by the monks to their scholars he admits not to have been extensive. But this was so, he argues, owing to the fact that the course of studies, as it existed in those days, was but narrow at best. What there was, however, the monks were willing to impart.

Taken on the whole, Mr. Archbold's work is fair and liberal. There is little in it that we can find fault with; and we hope that the author will be encouraged by the success attending this early effort to attempt some more ambitious work in the near future.

J. A. H.

Saint Paul : ses Missions. Par l'Abbé C. FOUARD. Large 8vo,
pp. 544. Paris. V. Lecoffre. 7frs. 50c.

HIgher praise can hardly be given to this volume than to say that it is the worthy continuation of the life of our Lord and the history of the Apostolic Church, which are so widely known in this country in their English—or rather, American—translation. The part now before us begins with the journey of Saul and Barnabas to Cyprus, and ends with St. Paul's arrival in Rome, covering therefore the sixteen years of his missionary life and labours. The number and variety of the incidents of this period are so great that it was

comparatively easy for such a practised writer to put before his readers a narrative full of interest ; but the Abbé Fouard has done much more than this. In a very masterly manner he shows the continuity that pervades the whole of St. Paul's teaching. The vocation of that great Apostle was to offer the Jews first the good tidings of the Gospel, and on their refusal to turn to the Gentiles ; his message was a larger and deeper conception of the work of redemption than had been preached by the Twelve. He realised vividly that all men alike were fallen, and were unable to rise from their state of misery and sin save by faith in Christ, who had become the head of regenerate humanity, a mystical body " animated with one life, and in which beats but one heart, that of Jesus." Thence followed the inefficacy of the works of the law—the external practices of Judaism—from the bondage of which the Apostle set the infant Church free. His inward character was no less consistent with itself from the beginning to the end of his career. To take one point alone : our author does not seem to be acquainted with Cardinal Newman's celebrated sermon on St. Paul's gift of sympathy ; but he brings out this feature of the Apostle's character very clearly and frequently, and connects it with that ill-health and suffering which made him so dependent on the companionship and help of his devoted disciples.

The details of the volume are worked out no less satisfactorily than the central ideas which give unity to the whole. Athens, Corinth, Asia Minor, are all clearly, sometimes brilliantly described ; and every circumstance bearing on the Apostle's missions is carefully brought out. In this, the historical part of his work, the author shows an intimate familiarity with Conybeare and Howson, Lewin, Lightfoot, and other Anglican authorities, who have done so much to illustrate and elucidate the history of St. Paul's life and labours. A clear conception of the Apostle's life and surroundings is an indispensable preliminary to understanding the Epistles ; and those which fall within this period are briefly but sufficiently explained, with all the advantage that a Catholic commentator enjoys over the most learned non-Catholic. Not only are the general drift and purposes of the Epistles brought out, but many difficult questions of detail are discussed with invariable sobriety and lucidity. As examples of such points we may refer to the account of the last apostasy and that which hinders its manifestation ; baptising for the dead, and, above all, the charismata in the Primitive Church. This last is illustrated and completed by comparison with the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," and the result is a most interesting account of the supernatural gifts of the first Christians.

The author gives us to understand that he purposes finishing his

work by the addition of two more volumes—one on the last years of St. Paul, the second on St. John. Every one who has followed him so far will join in the hope that he may be spared to complete such a valuable and important work.

Sermons on the Old Testament. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D.
London: Methuen & Co. 1892.

THIS volume of sermons, Dr. Driver writes in the preface, "may be regarded as supplementary, to a certain extent, to my 'Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,' published in 1891." In fact, the "Introduction" was intended as an exposition of the author's views on the authorship, date and literary character of the various books of the Old Testament; the present volume undertakes to show the permanent value of the Old Testament; how it may be "fruitfully and intelligently studied," and how it may be made "practically useful at the present day."

Dr. Driver has prefixed, as a kind of introduction to the series of sermons in the present volume, the paper which he read before the Church Congress, held last year at Folkestone, on the permanent, moral and devotional value of the Old Testament for the Christian Church. We are glad to find him saying therein, that "the moral and devotional value of the Old Testament—as indeed its religious value generally—is unaffected by critical questions respecting the authorship or date of its various parts." But though Dr. Driver says this, still it seems to us that he is only able to make the statement by abating much of what used to be claimed by Anglicans as the special prerogative and distinctive characteristic of sacred Scripture. At least, it is hard to see how the religious value of the Old Testament is unaffected by critical conclusions, if the following words sum up, as Dr. Driver says they do, its moral and devotional value: "I should say that these were partly its fine literary form, partly the great variety of mode and occasion by which the creed and practice of its best men are exemplified, partly the intensity of spirit by which its teaching is penetrated and sustained." If the secret of the devotional value of the Old Testament consists in such things as these, it is placed at once in the same category as the "Following of Christ," or even the "Pilgrim's Progress." But what has become of the unique prerogative of the Bible? Has Inspiration nothing to do with its religious value? Does it gain nothing from the fact of its Divine Authorship?

In the sixth sermon, Dr. Driver sets forth some points of view from which the Old Testament may be said to have a "permanent

importance." To summarise them we find that importance to consist in (1) the revelation it contains of the character of God, who is represented as a personal Being, spiritual, all-holy, all-just, all-wise, &c. ; (2) in the ideal of human character which it sets before us ; it stimulates us by many a noble example of faith and action ; (3) in the bearing which it has upon the Christian faith ; for Judaism was the cradle of Christianity ; and (4) lastly, in the evidence which it gives to the truth of Christianity ; for, " when all deductions which exegetical and critical honesty demands have been made, it is impossible to overlook or deny the correspondence subsisting between the anticipations and ideals of Israel and their fulfilment in Christ."

Such are the respects in which, according to Dr. Driver, the Old Testament may be said to be permanently important. And certainly we are not disposed to deny that, among the greatest glories of the Old Testament, are the revelation it affords of the Divine Nature, and its prophetical character in relation to the Incarnation. But what we notice is that Dr. Driver says nothing of Inspiration, as chiefly constituting the importance of the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Law to man. We do not see it said of them that they are the Word of God ; that they constitute the message which God delivered to His creatures before His coming among them ; and that as such they must ever be important to mankind. At first we were disposed to imagine that the author was reserving what he had to say on that subject for the sermon on Inspiration. But since in that discourse he even questions the advisability of calling the entire Bible the Word of God, it would seem that Dr. Driver has advisedly omitted among those things that make for the " permanent importance " of the Old Testament, the fact that it is truly the " Word of God."

In two sermons Dr. Driver discusses the story of Creation, one upon the subject of Evolution, the other on the first chapter of Genesis. In reality, these discourses contain little which is not to be found in the author's essay on the same subject in the *Expositor* for January 1886. From both, however, it is clear that Dr. Driver holds that the Bible narrative of the Creation cannot be harmonised with the teaching of science on the subject. The sermon, On the Growth of Belief in a Future State, is mainly taken up with an examination of the views expressed by the apocryphal Book of Henoch on the state of men after death : the belief in immortality, properly so-called, is held to have been of comparatively recent origin among the Jews.

Two sermons, towards the end of the volume, particularly struck us, because the writer seems to go out of his way to discredit the usually received interpretation of two beautiful passages of Holy

Writ (Is. lxiii., Ps. lxviii.). Dr. Driver questions the propriety of applying the first passage, which begins with the words, "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah ?" to Jesus Christ. He does not think that, rightly understood, the words refer to the Passion and sufferings of Christ. The verse of the 68th Psalm to which we especially refer is the 18th, "Thou hast ascended on high, Thou hast led captivity captive." "Captivity," in this passage, Dr. Driver tells us, is simply an abstract noun used for the concrete; and hence the words do not mean that Christ "led captive and subdued the power which enthralled others." We are not convinced by Dr. Driver's argument in either case; nor do we think that the Church has any need to change the Office either for Paschal Time or Ascension Day. We doubt not that she will continue to use without misgiving the glorious prophecies contained in the 63rd chapter of Isaiah and the 68th Psalm.

The discourses in the volume before us might more properly be said to be lectures than discourses. They are undoubtedly characterised by ability and eloquence; but it seems to us that too often the author strives to make a brilliant point at the expense of the traditional interpretation of sacred Scripture, even where there is plenty of evidence in defence of the older and commoner view. There is a great deal in the volume with which we are out of accord; indeed the writer seems to us to be at pains to show in what, according to him, the value of the Old Testament does not consist, rather than in what it does. Still with many of the opinions expressed we are in entire sympathy. In all the praise lavished on the Old Testament and in the encomiums pronounced on the prophets we heartily concur. But we go further; we regard it as being the unique excellence and glory of the Old Testament that it is truly and in a real sense, the "Word of God."

J. A. HOWLETT.

Napoléon et Alexandre Ier. L'alliance Russe sous le Premier Empire. II. 1809—Le second Mariage de Napoléon. Déclin de l'alliance. Par ALBERT VANDAL. 8vo, pp. 570. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1893.

THIS second volume of M. Vandal's great work is fully equal in merit and interest to that so favourably noticed in this REVIEW in October 1891. It deals mainly with Napoleon's diplomatic contests with the three great foes whom he had vanquished in battle. In this new sphere of action the victorious soldier proved himself a master in the choice of the policy to be followed, but he found that the execution of his plans was far more difficult in the court than in

the field. His overbearing manner, his violence of language, the tremendous material forces which he had at hand to support his demands—all these imposed upon the more timid of his adversaries ; these weapons, however, often fail in contests in which the victory is due more to finesse than to force. All through his career, too, he had to count with an adversary beyond the reach of his arms, and therefore unaffected by his threats. England, though one of her armies was rotting away in the swamps of Walcheren, and the other was cooped up within the lines of Torres Vedras, still commanded the ocean, and still refused to come to any terms with the usurper. In all the shifting and windings of the diplomacy of the time we can see the influence and the gold of England steadily working against Napoleon's plans. M. Vandal calls this the policy of Waterloo. The English Ministers were not geniuses ; but they knew that if they held their ground allies would ultimately come to their aid. As I remarked in noticing the first volume, M. Vandal seems to write with a purpose. He is far from indulging in any violent diatribes against England ; but he seems to say to his French and Russian readers : “*L'Angleterre—viola l'ennemi.*” No doubt he is right. Napoleon's design of using Russia against Germany failed mainly through England's intervention.

A conspicuous instance of the success of Napoleon's policy was the war with Austria in 1809. If his three vanquished opponents had united their forces at this time they might have overwhelmed him. He contrived, however, to beguile two of them and to crush the one whom he had thus isolated. The terrible battle of Essling, a greater check to his arms than even that of Eylau, placed him in a position of the gravest danger. The Russian and Prussian courts could not conceal their exultation at his embarrassment. But never did his genius as a diplomat and a general shine forth with such splendour as at this time of difficulty. While making almost superhuman exertions for a renewal of the struggle, he so imposed upon the Russian and Prussian ambassadors that they warned their Governments of the danger of junction with the triumphant Austrians ; and within a few weeks of his defeat the glorious victory of Wagram made him once more the dictator of Europe.

The story of the diplomacy connected with the Austrian marriage is admirably told by M. Vandal. As is well known, Napoleon would have preferred to marry the Czar's sister, the Grand Duchess Anne. What M. Vandal brings out is, that this design failed not through any refusal on Napoleon's part, but through the determined opposition of the dowager empress secretly backed up by Alexander. As the campaign of Wagram marks the height of Napoleon's triumph,

so the rejection of his proposal for the hand of the Russian Grand Duchess was the beginning of his downfall. Thenceforth Alexander and Napoleon both felt that they were destined to fight again, and in that struggle Austria and Prussia combined in the overthrow of France.

T. B. S.

Johannes Janssen. 1829-1891. Ein Lebensbild vornehmlich nach den ungedruckten Briefen und Tagebüchern desselben entworfen von LUDWIG PASTOR. Freiburg: Herder. 1892.

PROFESSOR PASTOR, favourably known to English readers by his valuable history of the Popes translated by F. Antrobus of the London Oratory, presents us with a sketch of the life of the late lamented Mgr. Janssen, the well-known historian of the German people. As one of the most gifted disciples of Professor Janssen, and possessed of his correspondence and other manuscripts, he has rendered a notable service by publishing this life within the first year after the professor's death in December 1891. Far from exhausting the materials placed at his disposal, he professes to give no more than an instalment while a larger biography based on the whole of the materials is in the course of preparation. Born in 1829, in Xanter, in Rhenish Prussia, widely known for its celebrated cathedral, John Janssen received his classical education in Recklinghausen, and afterwards followed the course of historical studies in the Universities of Bonn, Münster and Louvain. His superior intelligence and many accomplishments enabled him to enter on the career of Privatdocent in the Academy of Münster, an appointment which he shortly after exchanged for that of professor of history to the Catholic students in the gymnasium of Frankfurt-on-the-Main. Here it was that he contracted a personal friendship with John Friedrich Böhmer, the librarian of that town, who, although himself a Protestant, has rendered an important service to the Catholic Church by publishing the *Regesta Imperii*, and by strongly insisting on the absolute need of writing a history of the German people from the Catholic standpoint. This colossal design contemplated by Professor Janssen took definitive shape only in the course of many years, and after the most painstaking research in the chief libraries and archives of Germany. His work was the embodiment of the vast erudition thus accumulated, and it might be said that the first volume had hardly left the printer's hand when it began to work a complete revolution in the department of German historiography. Janssen had broken the back of an inveterate tradition.

The intrigues of diplomats or the successes of military leaders occupied a comparatively smaller share of his attention. The interests of religion, the development of science and art, the increase of literature, and, what is mainly to be emphasised, the social question as affecting the vast masses of the people, were handled by Professor Janssen in such a brilliant way as to win for him the admiration of Catholics and the acrid criticism of the more bigoted class of Protestants. Janssen's German style is really classical. In the six volumes of his history of the German people he has left his mark upon the progress of Germany in our time. To his vast learning he added a profound spirit of piety. Indeed, it would have been completely impossible to achieve such a gigantic undertaking, pervaded as it is by the spirit of religion and patriotism to his fatherland, had not the highest ideals which both can furnish been absent from the mind of its author. His biography by Professor Pastor merits our warmest recommendation.

BELLESHEIM.

Die Lehre von den heiligen Sacramenten der katholischen Kirche. Von Dr. SCHANZ. Freiburg: Herder. 1893. 8vo, pp. 757.

ENGLISH Catholic scholars will be familiar with the name of the learned author whose "Christian Apology," translated into English by Professors Glancey and F. Schobel, of Oscott College, has been favourably received by the leading Catholic reviews. Dr. Schanz has just brought out a bulky volume of nearly 800 pages on the Sacraments. The work has for its object to trace the historical development of the Sacraments and their accompanying ceremonies. The author has been led to take this plan of accomplishing his task, in view of the baneful fact that not a few able Protestant theologians, both in Germany and England, have set themselves to picture the institutions of the Christian Church in its first period as totally at variance with the Bible. Whereas the latter has laid a supernatural foundation, the Church is accused of having adulterated and deformed it by the introduction of mere human agencies. Hence, for Catholic theologians arises the need to come forth as defenders of the law of *continuity* which includes the development of the germs planted by Our Lord. I hardly need to point out that Professor Schanz has done his work in a thorough and scholarly way. It is a pleasing study to accompany the author from the Church life of the earliest times down to the days of the Tridentine and Vatican Councils whose dogmatical decrees are

the legitimate offspring of an unbroken continuity. While the first part (1-203) is devoted to the general principles, the second part treats of the Sacraments in particular. The arrangement is admirably clear.

Swift. Selections from his Works. Edited with Life, Introduction and Notes. By HENRY CRAIK. Two vols. 8vo, pp. 476. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.

WITH the exception of "Gulliver's Travels," the charming extravagance of which has so popularized it as a book for children, that its satire is overlooked and forgotten, the writings of Swift are but little known to the present generation of readers. In an age teeming with light ephemeral literature this is a matter for regret. The originality and vigour of Swift's ideas, his masculine common sense, expressed in his own clear, flexible, inimitable style, enlivened with touches of irony and caustic wit, would prove a valuable corrective to so much that is empty and superficial. Doubtless the broadness of their wit, and their want of restraint in expression and fancy, clashing with the taste and stricter requirements of the present day, are largely accountable for the comparative disuse into which Swift's works have fallen. It is Mr. Craik's main object to remedy this defect. He tells us in his preface that—

It is the aim of this Selection to give, as full as the exigences of space and the taste of the present day permit, specimens of the whole range of Swift's works, and to elucidate by notes what is obscure in intention or recondite in allusion.

As far as we can judge (only the first volume has come to hand), Mr. Craik has succeeded admirably. He has shown nice discrimination in the work of selection, and has pruned with a reverent hand. The extracts, which are long and continuous, so as to give the reader a good idea of the particular work from which they are taken, are preceded by introductions explanatory of the circumstances and objects of their composition, and elucidated throughout by copious notes.

Volume I. contains a few specimens of Swift's earlier poems, and long extracts from his earlier prose works; *Dissensions in Athens and Rome*; *A Tale of a Tub*; *The Battle of the Books*; *Journal to Stella*; and Contributions to the *Examiner*. The specimens are preceded by an excellent and scholarly essay on the Life and Works of Swift. For the style of production of the volume, its clear, correct printing, its neatness and good taste, the name of the Clarendon Press is a sufficient guarantee.

J. B. MILBURN.

Hungary and its People. By LOUIS FELBERMANN. 8vo, pp. 390. London : Griffith, Farran & Co.

IN this work we have a compendious account of the origin and history of the Hungarians. The natural features of their country, and their quaint customs are presented at some length. Courtship and marriage, weddings and funerals supply many interesting pages. The national music is touched upon and specimens given ; the national dress and dances described and illustrated. In fact, there are all the requirements for an interesting work.

We fear, however, that to most readers the book will prove somewhat heavy reading, in spite of the many interesting topics discussed. The arrangement is choppy, if the term may be allowed ; and the style is awkward and jarring. It is an ungracious task to be thus driven to criticise the picture whilst at the same time we are bound to praise the frame, for the manner in which the work is produced, its type, its paper, its cover in the national colours, and many of its numerous illustrations, leave nothing to be desired.

To any one desirous of information concerning Hungary we can, however, honestly recommend Mr. Felbermann's work. If it will not charm it will inform ; and to an intending tourist in Hungary will supply a veritable edition *de luxe* of a guide-book.

J. B. M.

Reviews in Brief.

Sanctae Viae Crucistationes XIV. Artificum Beuronensis manibus pictae. XIV. Imagines phototypia redditiae. Editio altera. Friburgi: Herder. 1892.—The revival of the Benedictine Order in Germany is intimately connected with a new departure in Christian art. To-day the works of the Benedictine school of painters have become the object of the most unqualified admiration in Germany and Italy. They are adorning the time-honoured walls of Monte Cassino, and likewise the convent churches of Beuron, Emmaus in the capital of Bohemia, and Maredsous in Belgium. The principles animating the Benedictine painters are quite in conformity with the traditions of their order—viz., prayer and study of art. They disclaim to act on the lines of any particular school, but are bent on bringing the specialities of all schools into the service of God. Foremost amongst their recent achievements rank the pictures of the Via Crucis in the Catholic Church, Stuttgart, which Mr. Herder, of Freiburg, has just brought out in admirable photos. They may be had in two sizes, $33\frac{1}{2} \times 43$ centimeters, and 23×32 centimeters, and will render excellent service either to religious communities or private individuals seeking to meditate on the mysteries of Our Lord's Passion. Far from adopting the severe manner of the Byzantine school, the Benedictine painters are faithful students of nature, but in the meantime elevate natural forms into the sphere of grace. Hence everybody in examining these excellent pictures becomes reminded of Fra Angelico da Fiesole. This comparison will suffice to commend this series not only to the public generally, but also to the students of Christian art. Indeed they represent the highest development of Christian art in our age.

Manual of the Holy Family. Compiled by the Rev. BONAVENTURA HAMER, O.S.F. 12mo, pp. 525. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Bros.—A convenient prayer-book containing the rules of the Holy Family, and a large number of devotional prayers. It contains several very useful and practical instructions on the duties of Catholics towards their parish church and their parish priest. Printed in America, the manual speaks of the latter under that term, so distastefully Lutheranish to European ears, “Pastor”; but

the advice given is sound and salutary. The following sentence might have been more clearly worded: "Generally speaking, persons and families who reside in one parish, and hold pews or seats in another parish belong to that other church, and are *subject* to its pastor." That is just what it comes to, but what it ought not to be. The subjection is not *de jure*, and ought not to be *de facto*.

The Ancient Church at Silchester. The old Manor House at Bedehampton, Early Window at Boarhunt (reprint from Proceedings of Hampshire Field Club). By Rev. G. W. MINNS, LL.B., F.S.A. 8vo, pp. 15.—Those who have studied the papers on Silchester contributed to the *Archæologia*, and especially the admirable essay and maps in vol. l., will feel grateful to Mr. Minns for putting into convenient form the latest data concerning the ancient Christian Church. Mr. Minns defends, rightly as we think, the Christian character of the structure against the contention of Mr. Wright, that Christianity had no hold upon Roman Britain. An extract is given from the sermon of the Dean of Winchester, referring to this ancient Basilica. With a light heart the Dean reads merrily his own views of primitive Christian worship into what remains after centuries of detrition and denudation. There, of course, the destructive forces of nature work for his theory. He does not point out triumphantly to the absence of vestments and Rosary beads, and crucifixes, as did a certain enthusiastic gentleman when treating of the ancient Church of Pieranzabuloe, unearthed from the sands after some fourteen or fifteen centuries. But he notes not unfairly the absence of a stone altar, and the orientation which corresponds with some of the older structures in Rome. Yet it was St. John Chrysostom who described these very churches when he spoke of the "*θυσίαστηρια*" in Britain. And "place of sacrifice" applied as the very name for an altar or sanctuary, is surely the strongest and clearest expression of belief in that local and objective sacrifice, the very idea of which was so studiously obliterated by Cranmer when compiling the formularies of the Church of England. Mr. Minns also mentions the discovery at Silchester of the ring with the Christian legend—*Seneciane vivas in Deo*—so suggestive of the inscriptions found in the Catacombs.

Le Roman d'une Impératrice, Catherine II. de Russie, d'après ses mémoires, sa correspondance, et les documents inédits des Archives d'Etat. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie., Imprimeur-éditeurs. 1893.—M. Waliszewski has been happily inspired in the title he has chosen for his book. Few romances can equal in interest

the chequered life of "Figchen" of Anhalt-Zerbst, daughter of an insignificant German princelet, who left her father's toy court to rule over all the Russias.

The "Roman d'une Impératrice" is not a panegyric, but a sober historical record. Catherine the Great was no saint, nor even a good woman, and her historian has not whitewashed her; but she built up on the foundations laid by Peter the Great that mighty empire which to this day forms the most serious complication of Eastern diplomacy. Her genius was essentially political, and was as remarkable for its limitations as for its brilliancy. No transcendental speculations ever illuminated or clouded her practical mind.

Creeds were useful weapons of government. Conviction, as she ironically remarked apropos of the reception into the Greek Church of her son's Lutheran *fiancée*, would follow profession.

Very interesting to political students is the gradual metamorphosis of her earlier liberal ideas into the absolutest theory of the "enlightened tyrant," which, as Waliszewski well remarks, is the social correlative to the philosophy of Voltaire.

The prophets of the *Encyclopædia* had no love for the people.

The book is admirably arranged for reference, though perhaps the narrative may suffer from the separate treatment of various phases of Catherine's character and career. No one who wishes to master the sociological elements underlying the "Russian Question" of to-day, or make himself acquainted with this mighty personality, powerful for good and evil alike, should fail to read M. Waliszewski's interesting "Roman."

A. THOROLD.

The Catholic Tune-Book. Edited by JOHN STORER, Mus. Bac. Oxon., Mus. Doc. Trin. Coll. Tor., &c. &c. London : Alphonse Cary, R. Washbourne, Benziger Brothers. 1893. Paper 2s. 6d. Cloth 3s. Pp. 156.—We welcome yet another tune-book to help in the better performance of our public Catholic services. Nothing more shows how much such helps are needed as the steady flow of these publications. We may say of this one that it brings into greater prominence the excellent Hymn-book of Father Langton George Vere's compilation, which is as admirable in size and arrangement as it is reasonable in price. Dr. Storer goes afield even of this book, and for those not yet quite prepared to give up the older Latin for the newer English devotions, new tunes have been provided to replace at will the more known ones. The preface tells us that "The Editor is responsible for the harmonies to all the German plain songs, traditional and ancient tunes." We feel sure that few, if any, will be disappointed, and we also are confident, as we sincerely hope, that a

close perusal of this little work will make it extremely popular. It bears the imprimatur of Cardinal Vaughan.

G. A. G.

Enchiridion ad Sacrarum Disciplinarum Cultores accomodatum opera et studio Zephyrini Zitelli-natali. Editio quarta. Large 8vo, pp. 246. Baltimore: J. Murphy.—A very useful handbook of reference for Church history. It contains the list of the Popes, with dates, and a few lines of biography to each, a list of the General Councils, with date, names of reigning Pope, Emperor, and the import of its action, the chief editions of the Old and New Testaments, the chief versions of same, list of the Fathers, and of ecclesiastical writers, with dates and brief notice, up to 1869. The part of the list which deals with modern times is very fragmentary. The list of American sects is also we suspect rather imperfect, as it includes only forty. A list of collections of Canon Law is followed by a list of local Councils, a list of the Sees in the United States, and last, but not least, a good index. The usefulness of the book lies in its help to ready reference.

Flowers of the Passion: Thoughts of St. Paul of the Cross, gathered from the letters of the Saint, by the Rev. LOUIS TH. DE JÉSUS-AGONISANT, of the same order. Translated from the French by ELLA A. MULLIGAN. 12mo, pp. 241. London: Burns and Oates. New York: Benziger Bros.—A small manual of pious considerations in which the Passion of Our Lord is referred to the various features of the spiritual life. Its portable size ought to make it a useful companion in Church, and especially at the foot of the Crucifix.

Do the Dead Return? By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 8vo, pp. 127. London: Fisher Unwin.—The work of a clergyman who assisted at a number of spiritualistic sittings with a few friends, of whose good faith he was assured. The reader is instructed in the successive chapters how the spirits knock, how they write, how they speak, how they make themselves seen. Facsimiles of their writing are reproduced for the benefit of the sceptical reader. Neither the penmanship nor the spelling would satisfy the most indulgent of Her Majesty's Inspectors. The author has deprived the book of much of its value by withholding his name. There are things which would be hard to believe even when told us by those whom we know, and which become incredible when told us by those whom we know not.

The Oresteia of Aeschylus. Translated by LEWIS CAMPBELL. 8vo, pp. 161. London: Methuen & Co.—A good translation into

English prose of the three dramas, *Agamemnon*, *Choëphorae*, and *Eumenides*, which make up an Aeschylean trilogy. The work is preceded by an interesting introduction and followed by notes.

A Gentleman. By MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN, LL.D. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago : Benziger Brothers. 1893.—This little book, which the author declares to be intended for young men from fifteen to twenty years of age, is cheerful, interesting, and amusing. It contains much useful information well condensed and expressed, and conveys sound advice that might with profit be read by many who have passed the limit of age marked in the author's preface. His chapters on "What to Read," and "The Home Bookshelf," display a cultured and well-stocked mind, and give sound advice on the method of choosing books.

The Child Countess. By Mrs. WILLIAM MAUDE. London : Washbourne. 1893.—This vivid historical vignette, though so far intended for children that its subject is the story of one who died at the age of twelve, may be read with interest by readers of all ages. Its bright narrative puts before us the life of English Catholics under the early Stuarts, and the persecutions to which they were subjected by the outlawry of their religion. The indirect lesson of faith and courage which it thus conveys renders it peculiarly suitable as a prize or gift book for children.

A Mixed Marriage. By Lady AMABEL KERR. London : Art and Book Company. 1893.—The drift of Lady Amabel Kerr's pathetic and touching tale is sufficiently indicated by its title. The story of a man without real religion or principle, brought up in the bitterest anti-Catholic prejudice, yet so subjugated by the individual charm of a Catholic girl, a charm in which the influence of the detested faith is often an unrecognised element, as to be willing at the moment to sacrifice everything to the chance of winning her, is an every-day one. In the case before us, he breaks his promise as to the religion of the children on the birth of a son, and thus creates a moral divergence between him and his wife, which not even their mutual attachment can ever wholly bridge. For the pathos of the situation is in this, that these hearts so widely separated in all matters of spiritual cognisance, do yet truly love each other according to the capacity of their different natures, while blindly groping for a link of higher sympathy across the gulf of misapprehension that divides them. The mother's crowning anguish is caused by the worthlessness of her son, who, removed from her care in childhood, and estranged from all home influences, early graduates in fashionable dissipation, while

his conduct suggests the bitter thought that it would have been better for him if she had never brought him into the world.

Raoul de Bérignan. By MRS. CORBALLIS. London : Burns & Oates.—This little volume narrates in a simple and graceful style the adventures of a little French *émigré* who, at twelve years of age, finds himself an exile in Southampton, deprived, as he believed, of all his immediate relations by the guillotine. How he here unexpectedly finds kind friends and a comfortable home, and how in his old age he revisits France and is joyously received by a surviving sister and her descendants, while his grandson, another Raoul, recovers his ancestral castle by marriage, forms the subject of a pretty story prettily told.

A Defender of the Faith. By TIVOLI. London : Griffith & Farran. 1892.—The sub-title of this clever character-sketch, “The Romance of a Business Man,” prepares the reader for the leading part that commercial intrigue plays in the development of the plot, while the element of religious controversy implied in the *rôle* of Defender of the Faith ascribed to its principal character, is enacted in the struggle between the Evangelical and High Church parties in a small mercantile community in the North of England some forty or fifty years ago. The principal interest of the story is concentrated in the downfall of the protagonist, and the gradual deterioration of his weak though superficially amiable nature, until the psychological moment arrives with its crucial temptation, to which the previous lowering of his moral standard renders him an easy prey. The *dénouement* is not wanting in sensational interest, but is reached a little too slowly for the ordinary reader, who is, as a rule, impatient of preparatory incident in fiction.

The Story of the War in La Vendée. By GEORGE J. HILL, M.A. London : Burns & Oates.—The story of the desperate struggle of La Vendée can never cease to interest all who admire faith and heroism combined. The present work, published as one of the volumes of the Granville Library, tells the story of that heroic episode of the French Revolution with the clearness of one fully possessed of the subject, and the animation of one deeply stirred by it. The result is a valuable contribution to the history of that time of tragedy and terror, making some of its most thrilling scenes live over again on the pages of the narrator.

Books Received.

Recent Evidence for the Authenticity of the Gospels. Tatian's *Diatessaron*. By Rev. M. Maher, S.J.

A Sevenfold Treasure. By Miss L. Dobrée.

A Guide to Heaven, for the use of those at Sea. 8vo, pp. 361.

A Mother's Sacrifice, and other Tales. By A. M. Clarke. Catholic Truth Society. 8vo, pp. 185. 1s.

Corona Beatæ Mariæ Virginis. Thoughts about the Blessed Virgin for every day of the year, taken from the writings of the Saints. 12mo, pp. 128. London : R. Washbourne.

The Catholic Tune Book. Edited by John Storer. 8vo, pp. 155. London : Alphonse Cary, R. Washbourne. 2s. 6d.

A Defender of the Faith. By Tivoli. 8vo, pp. 419. London : Griffith, Farran & Co.

New Light on the Bible and the Holy Land. By Basil T. Evetts, M.A. 8vo, pp. 496. London : Cassell & Co. (Illustrated.) 21s.

The Annotated Shakespeare, for Colleges and Schools. *The Tempest*. By Rev. D. Bain, M.A. 8vo, pp. 187. London : Sampson Low, Marston & Co.

Historic Towns: York. By James Raine, M.A. 8vo, pp. 221. London : Longmans, Green & Co.

Le Maréchal Ney. Par Henri Welschinger. Large 8vo, pp. 428. Paris : Plon, Nourrit & Cie.

William George Ward and the Catholic Revival By Wilfrid Ward. 8vo, pp. xlvi-468. London : Longmans.

Rome et Ses Monuments. Par l'Abbé Jean Roger. Two vols. 8vo, pp. 539-154. Louvain : Ch. Fonteyn. Paris : Hachette.

Histoire du R. P. Clorivière, S.J. Par le P. Jacques Terrien, S.J. 8vo, pp. 614. Paris : Ch. Poussielgue.

Le Mystère de N. S. Jésus Christ. Par le R. P. J. Corne. Two vols. 8vo, pp. 436-458. Paris : Delhomme et Briguet.

La Vierge Marie. Histoire de la Mère de Dieu. Par Mgr. Ricard. Large 8vo, pp. 300. Paris : Firmin Didot & Cie. (Illustrated.)

Les Tonga et le R. P. Joseph Chevron. Par le P. A. Monfat. 8vo, pp. 470. Lyon: Emanuel Vitte.

Méditations: A l'usage des élèves des G. Séminaires et des prêtres. Par L. Branchereau. Four vols, 8vo, pp. 530, 544, 478, 530. Paris: Vic et Amat.

Introduction à la Vie Spirituelle. Par le R. P. Jacques Masénius, trad. par l'Abbé Z. C. Jourdain 8vo, pp. 918. Paris: Hte. Walzer.

The Child Countess. By Mrs. W. Maude. 8vo, pp. 304. London R. Washbourne.

Die Willensfreiheit und ihre Gegner. Dr. Constantin Gutberlet. 8vo, pp. 270. Fulda.

Cicero de Oratore. Translated by E. N. P. Moor, M.A. 8vo, pp. 108. London: Methuen & Co. 3s. 6d.

Profit Sharing and the Labour Question. By T. W. Bushill. 8vo, pp. 258. London: Methuen & Co. 2s. 6d.

Story of the Nations: Poland. By W. R. Morfill. 8vo, pp. 385. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 5s.

Words of Wisdom from the Scriptures. Edited by Rev. John J. Bell. 8vo, pp. 202. New York: Benziger Bros.; London: Burns & Oates.

The Marriage Process in the United States. By Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D. 8vo, pp. 435. New York: Benziger Bros.; London: Burns & Oates.

Mes Souvenirs sur Napoléon. Par le Cte. Chaptal. Large 8vo, pp. 409. Paris: Plon, Nourrit & Cie.

Primitive Saints and the See of Rome. By Rev. W. Puller. 8vo, pp. 428. London: Longmans.

Précis Historique de l'Affaire du Panama. Par Aug. Lucas. 8vo, pp. 250. Paris: Delhomme et Briguet.

Histoire de la vénérable Mère Marie de l'Incarnation d'après Dom Claude Martin. Par l'Abbé L. Chapot. Two vols. 8vo, pp. 450-473. Paris: Ch. Poussielgue.

Manuel théorique et pratique d'Horticulture. Par un Religieux Jardinier. 8vo, pp. 701. Paris: Téqui.

Les Apologistes Laïques au XIXme Siècle. Par l'Abbé Duplessy. Large 8vo, pp. 572. Paris: Delhomme et Briguet.

Les Miracles de N. S. Jésus Christ. Par l'Abbé Candellier. 8vo, pp. 489. Paris: Tequi.

Historiæ Ecclesiasticeæ Compendium. L. Berti. Nova editio. Two vols. 8vo, pp. 389-378. Turin: Marietti.

Vie de Sainte Claire de la Croix. Par Lorenzo Tardi. Nouvelle édition. 8vo, pp. 279. Paris: Téqui.

Le Pape, les Catholiques, et la Question Sociale. Par Léon Gregoire. 8vo, pp. 264. Paris: Perrin & Cie.

L'Argument de Saint Anselme. Par le R. P. Ragey. 8vo, pp. 202. Paris: Delhomme et Briguet.

Le Compte Joseph de Maistre et Sa Famille. Par M. de l'Escure. 8vo, pp. 442. Paris: H. Chapelliez & Cie.

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1893.

ART. I.—THE PROPAGATION OF ISLAM.

AMERICA possesses a review, enjoying a pretty good circulation at the present day, which has taken for its title *The Arena*, and which entirely justifies its name; for it offers an open field upon which all who wish to make a violent attack, not only upon Catholicity, but even upon the very principles of Christianity, may disport themselves. Last year it tried to prove, after its own particular manner, that Christianity was but a kind of resuscitated Buddhism, and that even Christ Himself was but a true disciple of Buddha. To-day it is to the champions of Mohammedanism that it opens its pages. For we meet therein a certain Ibn-Ishak, a zealous follower of the prophet of Mecca, who makes a most violent attack upon the Christian religion, and who proclaims the universal triumph of the law of the Koran.

He relies chiefly upon the thesis that the religion of Christ is powerless to make any converts among the Mussulmans, while Islam can boast of numerous conquests in all directions, and above all among the Buddhists and English in India. According to his statement, Islam at the present time numbers 320 million souls, and before long the whole of Central Africa must be added to the Empire of Allah, for the peoples are beginning to recognise Mohammed as the only prophet.

This champion of Mohammed, however, will not acknowledge that its propagators have made use of violence, nor even

that they have brought any pressure to bear upon their various converts before achieving these great conquests ; and, according to him, the proof of this lies in the fact that at the time of the siege of Jerusalem the Caliph Omar spared the life of the Christians and did not put the inhabitants to the sword.

It would be useless to discuss at length such assertions, the falsity of which cannot but be apparent to any one possessing any notion whatsoever of the history and the religion of Mohammed. At the same time it may be of some little use to recall a few principal facts which it would be well for us to have in mind, so as to be able to refute theories of this description.

And, in the first place, let us put before our eyes the means by which Mohammed, owing to the mutual hatreds and jealousies of the people of Medina, was enabled to create for himself a party, ready for action, and how he commenced this series of *conversions* which led his faithful followers even to the heart of France.

I will borrow these facts from various historians whom it would be impossible to suspect of any partiality—from Dozy, Muir, Haines, Stobart, Gobineau, &c. No sooner did the *Envoy of God* feel himself established in his new country than he gave orders to the emigrants from Mecca to attack the caravans of their compatriots. Robbery and bloodshed were the consequences, and it was made known by revelation that a holy war was obligatory, and that heaven would be the reward of those who fell in the combat.

Little by little a campaign began in real earnest, a campaign of pillage and plunder. In 623 a large caravan, laden with merchandise of great value, was returning from Syria. Hearing that Mohammed was meditating an attack upon this precious convoy, Abu Sofyan, who was in charge, called to his aid troops from Mecca to protect it. But Mohammed allowed those auxiliaries no time to reach the caravan, but placing himself in ambush and taking advantage of the position of the ground and the weather, he defeated the troops from Mecca, and seized upon the rich booty which they were destined to defend.

The conqueror then gave himself up to the luxury of vengeance ; he caused a woman, who had composed some satirical verses upon him, to be put to death, and he punished,

in the same manner, an old man who had jested about the Mussulman religion. Some Jews who inhabited a suburb of Medina had, by some means, drawn down his anger upon them. The prophet laid siege to their quarter, took possession of it, and would have put all the inhabitants to the sword. Happily for them, however, they could claim friendship with some of the soldiers of Mohammed, and these, with great difficulty, obtained from their chief permission to spare the lives of the Jews, but all their goods were confiscated, and they themselves exiled to the frontiers of Syria.

The battle of Bedr, of which we have recalled the principal incidents, and the treatment of the Jews of Medina, show the methods of action of Islam, which it continued to follow all through Asia, Africa and Europe, and the means it relied on for success—viz., cupidity excited by the inducement to plunder unbelievers, and the promise of a paradise of sensual delights for those who fell upon the field of combat.

From that time forward Mohammed became a mere conqueror, enriching his own people with the spoils of the vanquished, a prophet armed with the sword—spreading his religion at the cost of men's lives, and distributing their possessions among his faithful followers.

We do not mean to assert that he made no converts by conviction; that would be to deny evidence. There undoubtedly were some who were converted in this manner, particularly among the first of those who shared his misfortunes in the earlier days of his career, and above all the Arabs who became his most faithful adherents. But it must be confessed that conversions brought about by means of bloody and cruel battles—with the prospects of sharing in unlimited plunder, with the fate of a miserable slavery, if not of a cruel death, on the one hand, and favours, honours and enjoyment without end on the other—cannot possibly be attributed to conviction or persuasion, nor can they win honour for a religion propagated by such means.

It cannot be denied, indeed, that, from the first victory of Islam, it was only by a continual series of triumphant wars that the religion of Mohammed succeeded in spreading itself throughout Arabia, as well as outside the country of the prophet.

Mohammed conceived quite a new style of mission. An army of savage warriors went about announcing to kings and peoples the command to embrace the new religion at the peril of beholding their country invaded by bands of daring plunderers, whose warlike ardour and religious fanaticism rendered them almost invincible. What might not be dreaded from these courageous fanatics, to whom happiness both in this life and in the next had been assured, according as they survived or succumbed in the combat? The real sentiments of these first followers of the Nabi may very easily be discerned when, shortly after the battle of Bedr, the latter was compelled to turn them against the people of Mecca, who came upon them three thousand strong, to avenge the defeat they had sustained near Bedr. But one thousand men could be got to follow the prophet out of Medina, and of these thousand faithful ones, three hundred abandoned him at the moment of the battle. The defeat of this small band, however, was due, no doubt, to the greed for plunder which caused them to forget the commands of the prophet, and to throw themselves upon the baggage of the enemy instead of taking care to defend their flank from a side attack.

This was a great blow to the power of the prophet; but he recovered himself shortly afterwards, at the time when a terrific storm, frequent enough at Medina, but quite unknown at Mecca, decided the besiegers of the former city to raise the siege. After this Mohammed's anger fell upon a tribe of Jews who had shown themselves hostile to him. He caused all the men, to the number of eight hundred, to be beheaded, and the women and children he sold to the Bedouins in exchange for arms and horses; as for their goods, they were all divided among the soldiers of the prophet, whose enthusiasm knew no bounds. On this point the learned Arabic scholar, M. Dozy, very truly says, after narrating the occurrence:

The influence of Mohammed and the fear which he inspired continued to grow more and more. Many of the neighbouring tribes submitted to him, more because of their fear of him, or of the love of plunder, than from conviction. The same may be said of the other peoples of Arabia, whose submission caused the dominion of the Nabi to equal the Empire of Byzantium. Thus, when Mohammed set out upon his first pilgrimage to Mecca, which his position made necessary,

and when he called upon all these "converted" tribes to take part in this great act of religion, the greater number of them showed themselves very reluctant, and excused themselves under various pretexts. The truth of the matter was that in this long journey there was nothing to be met with but the risk of danger, and no material benefits to be gained. These two great agents in the propagation of Mohammedanism, the fear of the sword and the inducement of gain, were then turned against the prophet. The zeal of his followers had, in most cases, disappeared.

So far the wars of Mohammed had been but acts of vengeance; in 627 he compelled the tribe of Juma to embrace the religion of Islam, and by his threats he caused them to persevere in it. This was the first of his conversions by the sword, which propagated Mohammedanism over Syria, and as far as the Pyrenees and the Himalayas.

We will not follow the prophet in his triumphal career; the acts by which his conquests are distinguished are too sufficiently well known to need repetition. We will simply, in a few words, recall the means which were employed to bring the inhabitants of those provinces, which had been reduced to submission by force of arms, to a belief in the new religion.

Mohammed declared his intentions from the year 631. In the ninth *sura* of the Koran, he declared that the unbelievers had still four months allowed to them in which to become converted; after which space of time the prophet would have no respect for those who still remained obstinately in their wickedness. "Destroy these idolaters wherever they may be found," so said the heavenly voice unto him; "make use of all the various artifices of war to subdue them. But should they repent, accept the faith and pay tribute, receive them with mercy, and permit them to return in peace to their homes." In another place it says: "When you shall meet with infidels, destroy them until you shall have made a great carnage."

In like manner the old historian, Wakidi, describes the Mohammedan conquest in the following words: "With the well-known cry of 'Ya Mansar Amit'—'strike, oh conquerors'—on their lips, they fell upon all those who opposed themselves to their dominion, and those whom they did not destroy they led into captivity. They burnt villages, fields ready for the harvest, palm woods, leaving behind them, wherever they passed, a whirlwind of flames and smoke." Al

Kindi gives Mohammed the credit of being the only founder of a religion who neither invoked prophecies nor offered the testimony of miracles as proof of his divine mission, but who proclaimed to all the nations of the globe that whosoever refused to receive him as a prophet sent from God, should be put to death and stripped of all his possessions, after having seen his wife and children led away into captivity.* And are not these words, spoken by Omar in presence of the corpse of Mohammed, full of meaning: "The prophet did not die before having exterminated all hypocrites and all unbelievers?"

For the rest there is no better proof of the want of sincerity in the conversions to Islam than the indisputable fact of the falling away of the Bedouin tribes after the death of the formidable enthusiast. In fact, nearly all of them immediately abandoned the Mussulman religion, and were only recalled to it later on, and then only little by little, as Al Kindi says, through fear, through pressing entreaties, and by the promise of sensual pleasures and of riches to be gained during this life, while awaiting the enjoyment of supreme happiness, and of the delights which those who were faithful were to possess in the next world.†

But it was the first of these motives above all which caused them to return to the fold of the shepherd armed with a sword. For Abu-Bekr, the successor of Mohammed, gave his commands to his soldiers in these words: "Exterminate the apostates without pity, by fire and by sword." Thus it was that ten thousand followers of the "false prophet" Mosailama were massacred to a man. In such manner did the eloquence of the sword do its work; and shortly afterwards Abu-Bekr was able to let loose his hordes upon the Roman Empire and upon Persia, without allowing to the conquered, who were made to follow them in these expeditions, time to realise their position, causing them to become attached to the religion of Islam by the glory of war and the inducement of a share in the plunder. What these conversions were worth, a scene described to us by El Tabari will teach us unmistakeably.

* Al Kindi, translated by Muir, pp. 35 and 100.

† *Ibid.*, p. 63.

After having gained his victory over the Persians, Abu-Bekr was desirous of presenting the plunder to those who were able to recite from memory the longest passages of the Koran. He caused the best and bravest of his soldiers to be brought before him, and questioned them as to what they knew of the subject. Amr ibn Madi made answer thus: "Nothing whatever; I became a follower of Islam in Yemen, and I have never since had time to occupy myself with the Koran." The one who was examined after him could only recite the following words: "*In the name of the God of mercy.*" In the eighth century the Arabs of Africa were not even aware that Mohammed had forbidden the use of wine.

Yezid, the successor of Moâwiah, was looked upon by the people of Medina as a pagan, and it was this opinion which caused a revolution leading to the pillage of the city and a massacre of its inhabitants, in which even the women and children were not spared. The cavalry of Yezid did not scruple to convert the great mosque into stables, and fastened their horses between the pulpit and the tombs of the prophets.

The same soldiers afterwards fell upon Mecca, and made no scruple to cast their missiles and fire against the Kaaba itself, which soon fell into ruins under their attack, and with it the "Sacred Stone."

Thus it was that the disciples of Mohammed acted up to the religion which they professed by word of mouth.

Again, the Caliph Walid II. amused himself by using the Koran as a target for his arrows, and caused his concubines to preside at the public prayers.

It is well known in what manner the religious transformation was brought about in Syria and in Egypt. The great number of sects had already considerably weakened the faith and paved the way for all kinds of apostasies. Many of the conquered population embraced Islam from the beginning, being impelled thereto by the great fear with which their fierce and terrible conquerors inspired them. Many Christians, however, still remained, and even the Caliphs themselves looked favourably upon their existence, for a very simple and natural reason. For the Mussulman law imposed upon all non-Mohammedans the duty of paying a certain sum as poll-tax, which went to enriching the treasure of their new masters. Thus too many

“conversions” meant so much revenue lost to the Caliph and his lieutenants. But the same motive caused a great number of Christians to ostensibly embrace the religion of their rulers, that by so doing they might escape a tax which ruined them and swallowed up all the fruit of their labours.

During the reign of Omar II., who was a thoroughly religious man, the changes of religion in Egypt became so very numerous that the officers of the Caliph thought it their duty to represent to him the danger which threatened the royal treasury if this state of things should continue. But Omar gave no heed to their warnings.

In Persia the number of Christians was but small; the followers of Zoroaster, on the other hand, were too weak in their faith to be able to keep to the ancient belief in the national prophet. During the reign of the same Caliph, the Governor of Khorassan addressed to him letters of complaint, in which he said that the Persians of his province became converted simply to escape paying the heavy tribute imposed upon them, and would not even be circumcised. “God,” answered the Caliph, “sent Mohammed to teach the faith to men, not to circumcise them.” They also pointed out to him that many of these conversions were but make-believe. But he would take no notice of this want of sincerity. Like a wise man, he foresaw that, even were these new converts of doubtful faith, their children, or at the least their children’s children, would, in the end, become good and sincere Mussulmans. And this was what really came to pass.

But the wish to escape paying the tax was not the only reason which caused the people of Syria, Persia, or Africa to become apostates from the Christian faith, or from their national beliefs, in the case of barbarous nations. Another and no less powerful motive was the humiliating treatment which the Christians received from the hands of their new masters, both in public and private life. Deprived of all public rights, compelled to wear a costume which would distinguish them from the Mussulmans, they were continually exposed to the most cruel indignities from the latter, and were held in the greatest contempt by them.

In the eyes of their conquerors, says Dozy, they were an impure and immoral race, who merited only disgust. The

Mussulman who found it necessary to speak to a Christian which he avoided if possible, stood at a distance from him, for fear of defiling himself by touching the garment of an infidel. The Christian was obliged to remain standing before him. Besides which there were numbers of legal ordinances of the most humiliating character proving the inferiority of these conquered races. One can easily judge, from the state of things in existence even to-day, to what vexations Christians must have been subjected by the Mohammedan soldiers and judges, and even by private persons. Many of them were unable to bear them patiently to the end, and endeavoured to escape from them by embracing the Mussulman religion, by which act they raised themselves in the eyes of these scorners of Christianity. We cannot pretend, however, that all the conversions to Mohammedanism were acts of hypocrisy without exception. The ignorance of the Christians in the East was very great at this time, and made them easy dupes. Separated for the most part from the centre of Christianity, given up to the many fantastic opinions which their theologians had dreamed and sustained, their minds were open to receive any novelty.

The countries which had listened to the voice of Manes, of Priscillus, or which had been traversed by the Iconoclasts, profaning and devastating the sacred temples, were well prepared to accept the teachings of another prophet of the same class, were he even Mohammed himself. Added to which, Islam presented itself to the imagination of the Orientals with all the prestige of success, of a success without precedent, and which was cited by its warriors as proof of their divine mission. These vulgar minds could not but be impressed by the spectacle of these unheard-of victories, and easily believed that God was with them. Was not Mohammed the Paraclete promised by God; and his religion, borrowed for the most part from the Christian religion, but a continuation of the same?

In Persia the transformation was still more easily effected. The conquests of the Greeks had caused an interruption in the religious traditions of the country. The Parthians had resuscitated them but very imperfectly, the religion of Zoroaster was forgotten, and the Persians professed no other religion as their own. True it is that the Sassanids were anxious to again

revive the religion of the Avesta. But this had never been really received in Persia proper. The Sassanids had imposed it upon their subjects, but their tyrannical conduct went no little way in rendering it odious in the eyes of the people, and the Persians possessed no solid tie which could bind them to the worship of Sapor and Chosroës. They exchanged their prophet, and found again in Islam a great number of their Zoroastrian beliefs.

It is a remarkable fact that the Persians, a religious people above everything, became the most ardent and most intelligent disciples of Mohammed, and gave to Islam its theologians, its moralists and its religious orders, and it is owing to them that this religion now ranks as one of the most important in the world.

Moreover, many of the Persians discovered that Islam did not devote itself sufficiently to religious sentiments. This idea produced many new theories, both mystic and ascetic, and a multiplication of sects, of which each one endeavoured to outdo the other in religious enthusiasm, and in practices of exterior devotion, thus causing Persian Mohammedanism to be anything but the genuine religion.

But the events which took place in the country parts of Persia show, better than anything else, how easily won were the triumphs of the bands of Bedouins who carried thither the religion of Mohammed. Persia, like Syria for that matter, reckoned among its inhabitants a considerable number of Arab immigrants, even entire tribes who had come from beyond Sinai. Many among them were Christians. But, notwithstanding this, they joined hands with their Mussulman brethren, and assisted them in crushing first the Sassanid and then the Byzantine empires. It was the Beni-Tai and the Beni-Namr in particular who assisted in the defeat of the Persian armies. Moreover, as Muir relates, "The Arab general, Mothanna, when exhorting his troops before these battles, did not speak to them of the religion of Islam which they were to propagate in the name of Allah, but solely of plunder, of slaves to be captured, of countries to be won, so that they might be able to enjoy their fruits."

All this clearly shows in what manner Islam, or rather the dominion of the Arabs, spread itself over the East. But we

must give a glance at the West, where this dominion also established itself and continued in power for long centuries. I refer to Spain. This country was at the time in an altogether abnormal position. It alone, of the whole Roman Empire, was the one province that still remained pagan. Christianity had certainly been preached there, but the people had learnt but little of it. The conquest of the country by the Visigoths had supervened; Arianism had followed in its wake, and, with Arianism, religious persecution. The conquest by the Suevi in the north-west had produced the same effects. Moreover, the German conquerors had stripped the Iberian inhabitants of their goods, and thus there was a triple source of disunion and even of antagonism. In addition to all this, the great lords of the Visigoths were continually fighting among themselves, and these quarrels were the cause of much suffering among the Iberian people. But the conversion of the Visigoths under Reccared quite changed the situation and altered the position of things; then the Arians became the disaffected party, and turned against their sovereigns and the ruling classes.

After the death of this great prince the Spanish monarchy fell, little by little, into complete decadence. Morals became corrupted, political troubles were of more frequent occurrence; the attacks of the Greeks and of the Basques caused the power of the Visigoths to become weaker and weaker. And, finally, the banishment of the Jews prepared new ground and new means for foreign invaders.

Thus it was in the midst of a state of corruption, of violent quarrels, and of plots of vengeance, that the Arabs, who were actually called in by a Spanish general, the too famous Count Julian, entered the kingdom of the pious Reccared, and gained an easy victory over the forces which opposed their invasion. Two armies, under the respective command of Tarik and of the Governor of Africa, Moussa, arrived successively, and in eighteen months completed the conquest of the Spanish soil. Treason, dissensions, the enervation of morals, and the tyranny of the Visigothic kings made this feat an easy task. Toledo was surrendered by its bishop, a Greek by birth, and who led the Arabs against Pelagius himself. The principal inhabitants of this unfortunate town were put to death. Seville and Merida were taken only after a long siege.

Many other cities were burnt by the savage Moussa, who cruelly tortured his prisoners, crucifying the chief among them, and slaughtering the women and children, as the Spanish historians, Roderigo and others, assert.

One can understand that these events, happening among an ignorant and corrupt people, would be the cause of many apostasies. These became very numerous, especially among the slaves, who no sooner professed their belief in Islam than they were transformed into farmers by the Caliph of Cordova.

But shortly after the conquest, the Moors allowed the Christians freedom to practise their religion, which permission at the same time did not prevent them being placed in a very inferior position, exposed to numerous though isolated insults and acts of oppression. And this, naturally, was the cause of many Spaniards embracing the religion of their African conquerors. Nevertheless, as by degrees the Catholic kings rescued Spain from the yoke of the foreigners, Islam disappeared with them, without leaving any trace behind, when the last Moorish State had succumbed beneath the attack of Ferdinand and Isabella, and with it the city of Granada, which had been the Moors' last refuge.

Thus, notwithstanding all these conquests, there was nothing about them of which the Mussulman religion could boast—no more than in those of the other countries of the Roman Empire, where the scimitar and the promise of temporal advantages were the means used to convert disciples.

But, if such was the state of things in Christian countries, the scene completely changes if we turn to the pagan peoples. There we shall see Islam spread and develop itself with most extraordinary force and rapidity without being able to ascribe this ever-increasing propagation either to violence or to the allurements of temporal benefits.

Let us, however, before entering into any details upon this subject remark that India was not by any means a country favourable to this propaganda. Islam was introduced into it by conquest. Mahmoud, the fierce sultan of Ghazni, seized Kashmir, Gujerat, and the greater portion of Northern India. At Sômnâth he destroyed the great idol, the gigantic *lingam* of Çiva, and founded a Turkish kingdom beyond the Indus. This happened in 1025. In the following century Mohammed

Gauri took Benares and destroyed all its idols. But these proceedings were quite exceptional. As a general rule, Turkish fanaticism was compelled to yield before the firm resistance of the Buddhist or Brahmanic peoples, and to leave them free to practise their religion. Idols remained everywhere, and at Benares were even re-erected. Islam was only practised in India by the Court and the rulers of the people, and though it may count a number of disciples in the vast Transgangetic peninsula, still there are very few among them who belong to the Hindu race ; they are mostly Turks, Persians, Arabs or Mongol immigrants, who may be counted by millions.

What we have said about India may be also applied to China. In the Flowery Kingdom, as upon the banks of the Ganges, are to be found many Mussulman communities ; but in these two vast countries they can count but very few natives who have been drawn by persuasion to embrace the teaching of the prophet of Mecca. In China, at least, the scimitar has never aided the apostolate, but the Chinese emperors have shown themselves favourable to the admission of the Mussulmans into their States, and allowed liberty to the religion of the Koran.

One of the first missionaries of this new religion, probably an uncle of the founder himself, was in 628 sent to the Court of Tai-Tsong, the second emperor of the Tong dynasty, the same who gave to Buddhism all the encouragement in his power. In 630 the first mosque was built at Canton, and it may have happened, though the fact is not known, that some Chinese, lovers of novelty, embraced the religion of Allah. Religious innovations were then fashionable. Besides which Allah might have appeared to the eyes of the enlightened Chinese as identical with Shang-ti, and to take part in the ceremonies of the mosque might appear to them the same as participating in the Tao-Shei or Buddhist ceremonials.

This mission, however, produced no remarkable results, and the real establishment of Mohammedanism in China was caused only by the immigration of Arab, Turkish, or Mongol tribes into the provinces of the West.

It was the merchants who, as usual, paved the way. Chinese annals tell us of people from Barbary who settled in the West under Hiuen-tsung, of the Tang dynasty (713-756),

and who carried with them their sacred books. These could not have been Buddhists, or the Chinese historian would not have spoken of them in such a manner. They must have been either Turks or Tartars to answer to such a description. Moreover, this emperor, being hard pressed by a rebel general who wished to take possession of the capital and to place the imperial crown upon his own head, could think of no better expedient than to get assistance from the Mohammedan Turks, at the same time promising to reward them richly for their services. In 756 another chief of these Tartars, described as king of Si-Yu, placed himself with an army of 5000 men at the service of the same emperor. Others joined him later on, and these foreigners establishing themselves in the provinces of the West thus laid the seat of Mohammedanism in the Chinese Empire.

At the present day the provinces of the north-west and of the south-west* contain an extensive Mohammedan population, whose ancestors were brought into China by the favour of the Mongol emperors. This favour they continued to enjoy under the Mings, and even during the Mandchu dynasty, the Emperor Yong-cheng having a Mussulman for one of his wives.

During this century the various revolts of the Mussulman people eventually grew into a dangerous civil war, which caused a change in the disposition of the Chinese governors towards the rebels, and from that time forward Islam has been on the continual decrease in the empire.

As we before remarked, in all those countries which we have already mentioned, the conquests by conviction which Islam had made resolve themselves into a very small number. One cannot point out a single province or even town whose inhabitants embraced the religion of the Arabian Nabi, either through the peaceful preaching of apostles or from conviction.

But we shall find quite a different state of things if we turn our eyes towards the pagan countries where polytheism is much in practice.

The first to embrace Islam from a kind of conviction were

* Principally Yün-nan. In 1295 Kubilai Khan created a Mohammedan from Turkestan, by name Omar, governor of this province. At the present day this religion numbers 800 families at Canton.

Turks of the West. Carried away by the ardent proselytising of the Arab chiefs, and overjoyed with the expectation of a paradise of sensual delights, they became the most fervent disciples of Mohammedanism and its most enthusiastic and violent propagators. The religion of the Arabian prophet and Buddhism were then struggling for mastery in Central Asia; the Turks, who were a turbulent race, ever greedy for the pleasures of this world, were ready to follow the teaching of the one which best satisfied their aspirations. They travelled far from their homes to convert their neighbours, the Afghans, in a manner more or less violent, and afterwards they founded a Mussulman kingdom in India, while at the same time a Mongol prince, chief of one of the States adjoining Turkestan, renounced Christianity so as to become a Mussulman like them.

Later on we shall see how they invaded Syria, destroyed the Greek Empire, and spread the kingdom of the Crescent as far as the banks of the Danube.

But the ambition of these disciples of Mohammed did not confine itself alone to the Asiatic continent, to the north of Africa, or the south of Europe; it seemed as if they wished to embrace the entire world. They met with great success in the Indian Archipelago and in the western islands of Oceania, as they also did, and still do to-day, in the central regions of the Dark Continent, among the Blacks, who have become their victims and the raw material for their vile trade.

As a general rule the first seeds of Islam were carried into these countries by merchants attracted thither by their love of gain. After them, and owing to them, colonies were formed, and then came the conquest. As early as the ninth century an Arab merchant had communicated a certain knowledge of his faith to the Malay people. He had come from Omar and traded in spices, which formed the chief commerce between this country and China.

In the thirteenth century, according to some writers, in the fourteenth according to others, a sheik from Mecca converted a great number of Achinese of Sumatra, and probably their prince among the rest; for, a few years later, their chief, who went by the Arab name of Al Melik ad-dhâdir, was a most zealous follower of Mohammed and engaged in a very bitter

war with his infidel neighbours. Marco Polo testifies to the state of things in these countries.

About the same time the Sultan of Malacca in his turn embraced Mohammedanism. In the Sunda Islands, Buddhism and Brahmanism had already preceded the religion of these new apostles and struggled hard against its advance, but they were only able to retard its progress very slightly. Lambri and Pasuri embraced it without resistance, and from these it spread little by little, from island to island, meeting with varying fortunes, but with continued successes side by side with the checks and the difficulties on its way. Such was the case in Java, Borneo, and in many other places. In Java the kingdom of Majaprahit occupied a great portion of the island ; its king would not listen to the preaching of the missionaries, and maintained his subjects in their pagan faith. In 1476 the Mussulmans took possession of his capital, overthrew his power, and from that time forward were able to dictate the religion of the country.

In Celebes and Macassar the princes were converted by the words of "missionaries" from Mecca and by their ministers. The same happened in the Sulus and in a part of the Philippine Islands.

The progress of Mohammedanism met with the same success everywhere. It was the Arab merchants, adventurers, sometimes preachers, who went from Mecca or from Syria and won over to their cause some city or some local chief. He, in his turn, converted his subjects, and then spread the faith round about him by the force of arms. But in the last-mentioned islands violence played a very small part in the transformation. The same was the case in the cities of Africa of which we are now going to speak, though not with the Copts, who were treated with favour in the commencement, but were afterwards persecuted with great fury, particularly by the savage Hakim, so that the greater part of them were unable to endure the weight of their misfortunes and put an end to them by abjuring their faith. But in Nubia the tribes, who have richly merited the evil reputation they enjoy, embraced Islam with enthusiasm, and boasted that there was not one amongst them who belonged to any other religion. This change was brought about by some Arabs who emigrated at the time of

the Crusades. In any case this triumph of Mohammedanism among peoples who are described as "the most accomplished rogues and the most unscrupulous robbers in the whole world," does not reflect great honour upon the religion which conquered them.

Ever since the sixteenth century Islam has, without ceasing, gained ground in the regions of Africa. In the seventeenth century Cordofan and Darfur were won over to it; and later on the State of Wadai and of Baghirmi were also added. The way in which this religion was introduced into Wadai is described in a most detailed manner by an Arab author, Mohammed el Tounsi, whose work has been translated into French by M. Perron. A descendant of the Abbassides, Saleh by name, having been driven out of Egypt by the Fatimites, plunged into the sandy plains, and from Senaar passed on to Wadai, which at that time was entirely given up to the worship of idols. The preaching and the religious practices of the new-comer excited first the wonder and then the admiration of the inhabitants. Thus it came to pass that the greater number of them did not hesitate to place him at their head as chief both in a civil and a religious capacity. No sooner was his power confirmed than Saleh began to preach war against the infidels. The Wadaites, threatened with a disastrous war and terrified by the fanatical zeal of these unexpected enemies, at once submitted and hastened to embrace that faith which could save them from the evils which threatened them. But this was not sufficient for this extraordinary apostle. He still felt it necessary to subdue the neighbouring tribes and to reduce to slavery all those who resisted him.

Baghirmi has been Mohammedan for some years, and the armies of the Sultan of Wadai had a good deal to do with the change of religion among this people.

Mussulman expeditions and preachings first commenced in Central Africa at the opening of the tenth century. Information of a particularly precise and trustworthy character has been given to us upon this subject by the Arab author Hasan ibn Mohammed al Wazar, who became converted to Christianity and was afterwards known by the name of Leo Africanus. This writer lived in the thirteenth century. He informs us

that in the eleventh century Nigritia had been already explored by a missionary, a commercial adventurer who established Islam therein, or rather sowed the first seeds of it ; after which the Almoavid Sultan, Usuf ben Tashfin, commenced the subjection of the negro tribes in the regions of Melli and Sonhay, and later on, towards the middle of this century, those of Silla also embraced the Mussulman religion. Shortly after, Timbuctu followed their example, and thus became the largest Mohammedan State in this part of Africa. From here the religion spread itself as far as the Niger, and Leo Africanus in his time counted no fewer than five kingdoms which were subject to its laws, Timbuctu and Bornu being the most celebrated. The latter, towards the end of the eleventh century, extended as far as Egypt.

The system generally followed in these countries by the preachers of Islam was to apply directly to the sovereign and to win him over to their cause by the use of appropriate arguments. The conversion of these potentates was the *shortest* means possible of procuring that of their subjects. Thus it was that, step by step, they made their way as far as the Great Lakes, but it was the work of long centuries.

Nor did the East of Africa escape these venturesome propagators of Islam. In the seventh and eighth centuries already some Arabs, who had come directly from their native country, settled all along the coast in the neighbourhood and below the Straits of Bab-el-mandeb. They drove away the inhabitants of the place and founded the State of Harar, whose capital not one single infidel is allowed to enter. From thence they proceeded to win over the Somalis and a portion of the Gallas, the rest remaining either Christian or pagan. Later on other invaders from Oman converted Zanzibar into a Mussulman State, and in this manner gained over some neighbouring tribes. Uganda only partly listened to the solicitations of these propagators of Islam. The events which have occurred lately in this last-mentioned State are too well known to make it necessary for us to enter into further details upon the subject.

In short, some conversions in these regions are due to persuasion, and others to either moral or physical violence.

The Island of Madagascar, however, deserves particular mention, for, as Haines says, it has proved how false is the opinion which is held by many to be indisputable—viz., “that Islam never loses its hold of any country of which it has once taken possession.”

The exact period of the introduction of Mohammedanism into the Island of Madagascar cannot quite be determined. It was first taken there by preachers who addressed themselves to the Antaimorona tribe. This tribe was, at that time, divided into two castes, the one sacerdotal and superior, who still honoured the supreme God Who had been universally acknowledged by their ancestors ; the other and more popular caste, which had abandoned the God of their fathers, and given themselves up to the worship of inferior genii, his agents. A violent struggle had taken place between the two, and had ended in the defeat of the Monotheists. Thus it was that these latter eagerly welcomed the disciples of Allah, and the people, owing to their easy morals and because of the celestial pleasures promised to them, also followed their example, and the whole tribe, apparently, became Mohammedan. But their ardour was not of long duration, and some years later the Antaimorona returned to the worship of their former gods, though not without retaining at the same time some relics of Mussulman practices. They still speak of Allah, still make use of some of the formulas of the Koran liturgy or of those inspired by Mussulman fatalism, such as “it is written by Allah” (*mektub Allah*) ; but that is about all. The Koran was replaced by books of fortune-telling, compiled by the saints of their religion, and which, though occupying a place of honour in their libraries and in their houses, are completely ignored by the islanders, who do not even take the trouble to find out what they contain. Some of their books, called *Sora-be*, are filled with legends of which their former gods are the heroes. The Comte de Mandave, who endeavoured to colonise the south of this great island under Louis XVI., tells us that “the region of Anossi is inhabited by Arabs who went thither in the sixteenth century.” He also adds that the Comoro Islands were also subdued by the same adventurers. Thus Mohammedanism in this island is not the fruit of conversion. But in spite of all this

Mandave declares that the inhabitants of Madecasse possessed only some books of divination, astrology and medicine, with the exception of a few senseless legends.*

In the south-east of Madagascar are to be found a certain number of Mohammedans, but these are the descendants of Arab immigrants, who came directly from Mecca and established themselves in these parts. For the rest their Mohammedanism is not at all pure. They possess a quantity of fetiches to which they give most zealous worship, as for example the stone elephant of Mananjari.† But I have said enough, I imagine, about the great African island. Let us pause for a moment to glance at the present state of Mohammedanism in its entirety.

It would be superfluous to point out the different Mussulman provinces in the north of Africa and in the Turkish Empire, or those in Tartary, Afghanistan, and in Eastern Asia generally. India numbers from sixteen to twenty million Mohammedans, who are not entirely exempt from idolatrous practices, and live principally in the towns. They keep themselves aloof from the other inhabitants of the country, whom they hold in great contempt, according to the laws of the Koran.

In the Indian Archipelago, Islam has made such conquests as we have already shown, and is constantly spreading, thanks to the great number of merchants, pilgrims, and even pirates, who are constantly exercising their zeal. But this Islamism is more nominal than real. The same is the case in Java, where the religious laws are not in the least observed. But the Mohammedan *ulema* or priests, of whom there is a very large number, keep up a savage fanaticism which prevents apostasy. The same appears to be the case in Persia, and Count Gobineau, who lived in this country from 1855 to 1858, says that Islam in Persia may be looked upon as dead, if not yet entirely buried, which means to say that the Persians possessed nothing but the name of Islam. In the towns, above all, irreligion absolutely predominated.

* See Pougel de S. André, "La colonisation de Madagascar d'après la correspondance inédite du Comte de Mandave." Paris, 1886.

† See the interesting work of M. Gabriel Ferrand, "Les Musulmans à Madagascar et aux îles Comores." Paris, 1891. E. Leroux.

The principal strength of the Mohammedan religion is to be found, as every one knows, in the Turkish Empire and in the north of Africa. The religious doctrines and practices are there still honoured and in full vigour, which is owing, above all, to the powerful organisation of the clergy, of whom the Sultan is the head, by the intermediary of the Sheikh-ul-Islam, the actual director. The Berbers, in general, neglect their religion, eat pork, drink to satiety, and very seldom, if ever, attend the public prayers.

It has been said of the Persians that "they accepted Islamism under reservation," and of the Arabs that "they propagated it even by the use of arms, on the condition that they themselves should not be subject to its laws." In fact, they proclaim Allah and his prophet, but they only laugh at the prayers, the fasts, the ablutions, and even at the pilgrimages prescribed by him. Nor are the Chinese Mussulmans of an exemplary orthodoxy, though the opposition which they encounter from other religions in the empire keeps up in them a more religious frame of mind, and makes them more faithful to the principles of their religion.

But notwithstanding all this, Islam still reigns supreme over widespread regions, and is professed by numbers of people, either in their hearts, or by word of mouth alone; but even in the latter case, so thoroughly are they attached to it, so fanatically do they cling to it, that there is no room for the slightest hope of change or of conversion. While it is dying out of the hearts of some, it continues to spread in the uncivilised regions of Africa, and especially in Oceana. It has often been asked what can be the cause of this uninterrupted development, and how it is that the propagation of Christianity is so difficult, while its most redoubtable enemy grows and spreads continually, and without difficulty? The answer to this question is easily found. In the early days Islam spread itself by the sword, by the violence exercised by those millions of valiant and fanatical warriors who went forth from Arabia to overrun Asia, Africa, and Europe: and even though these savage conquerors did not always compel all their new subjects to embrace their faith, though they preferred to receive from them a tribute, they nevertheless made the existence of these infidels under their sway so miserable that a

great number of them were not long able to endure their unhappy position, and turned Mussulman to escape from the humiliations, vexations, and oppressions which weighed them down. Besides which ambition and avarice played also their part, and caused many to forsake their duty. This was all the easier, because of the ignorance of the people, the weakness of their faith, and the many religious dissensions which had caused the greater number of them to lose their sense of duty. The resemblance between the Christian teaching and that of Islam, and the many things which Mohammed borrowed from the Bible, contributed not a little towards leading the people into error, all the more so because of the splendid victories which the Mussulman troops made believe were the working of Providence.

Add to all this, that the tyranny of the Byzantine emperors and of the kings of Persia had prepared many of their subjects to be willing to try any lot which seemed to them a happier one under any other dominion.

As to the present spread of Mohammedanism, it can be explained easily and from different causes.

The first, and I think the principal one, is the nature of the Mussulman doctrine itself, its extreme simplicity, which excludes all mystery and all dogma at all difficult to understand. One only God, and the mission of a man sent by Him—that sums up and includes the whole. This doctrine satisfies at the same time both the needs of religiosity and the natural monotheistic tendency of the human mind and heart.

More than this, its moral system, which is so wide and so elastic, completely satisfies the strongest demands of the human passions—thirst for pleasure, love of riches, free scope for anger and revenge, the desire of plunder, &c.

In addition to this, a paradise with the hopes of a future life, wherein all the passions will be fully satisfied and all pleasures will reach their highest point, entire absence of any subjection to a foreign spiritual authority regulating one's acts and imposing obedience to its decrees.

All this is well suited to please these coarse and corrupt peoples, and also their sovereigns, whose virtues are no greater than those of their subjects.

It is necessary, if we wish to understand these conversions

to Islam, to make ourselves acquainted with their real nature. The apostles of the Koran do not require great things from their neophytes—no change of life, no correction of morals. The converts, in these days above all, have only to profess this formula—“Allah is God and Mohammed His prophet;” and all is said. They do not look into their hearts, they do not seek to discover their motives; they are left to their former superstitions and prejudices on the one only condition—they must abandon the worship of idols. The whole teaching confines itself to this one sentence alone, unless the convert himself should study his new belief. When converting an African prince who is a polygamist and a slave-dealer, the Christian missionaries require him to abandon his wives and to put an end to his traffic in human beings. The Mohammedan preacher, on the contrary, tells him that he may keep his wives and even add to their number if he wishes. It will be easily guessed which teaching would be accepted by an African, Javanese, or Manilla potentate, unless he were really inspired by a higher grace.

Another cause of success is to be found in the proselytising spirit of the Mussulman, in the laity as well as in the *imams*, in the merchant no less than in the pilgrim, and even in the brigands who ravage the lands of the “infidels.”

One must confess that the Mussulman, above all he whom we may call the *bourgeois* Mohammedan, knows nothing of self-respect. He is proud of his belief, and is constantly displaying it before everybody. This is not surprising. The Christian showed the same disposition, until hostile minds employed every means in their power to cast ridicule upon his doctrines and practices. The Mussulman, who possesses but very few of these latter, and who finds nothing troublesome or difficult to understand as to what he should do or believe, is not called upon to meet with the same sneers against his religion, before which human weakness cannot fail to blush.

The original spirit of Mohammedanism has thus far, in general, been perpetuated. This spirit consists in the contempt of all religions which do not recognise a pure monotheism, or contain mysteries, or acknowledge saints or intermediaries between heaven and itself. Believing themselves superior to all the rest of humanity, and full of contempt for all who are

not disciples of the last and greatest of the prophets, the Mussulmans, as a rule, have no other temptation than to parade their belief and to impose it upon everybody else.

Thus every Mussulman who finds himself in an "infidel" country becomes a zealous missionary of his faith, and as merchants and adventurers professing the same belief swarm everywhere, it is easy for them to cast the seed of their word all the world over, and to make it grow and bear fruit.

More than this, they have the diplomacy to address themselves, in the first place and directly, to the princes or chiefs of the different countries which they wish to convert, to flatter them, and to make themselves attractive by their pleasant manners. Once these petty African or Indian despots are won over, they begin to impose their new faith upon their subjects and upon the other tribes which have fallen into their power by the fortunes of war. In fact, the doctrines of the Koran, far from preaching humility and self-abnegation, exalt man's pride and egotism, and shows him that his salvation is the work of his own hand, and temporal triumph over infidels an act of supreme merit and the principal end to be gained.

This doctrine, therefore, was admirably suited to the natural dispositions of man, and most especially to the opinions, character, and vices of the people of the East and Africa. To be a Christian one must obtain the victory over one's mind and heart, and lift one out of oneself by constant efforts; to be a Mussulman it is sufficient to follow the inclinations of our corrupt nature and to wallow in the mire. Thus Islam has destroyed all the nobility of the human soul and all its higher aspirations wherever it has gained complete sway. Persia and Spain alone have escaped this degradation and retained some remnants of a superior civilisation and of the arts and sciences, because in these countries Islam, as we have already remarked, reigned but in name.

But, on the other hand, a faith so indulgent to the bad side of nature, and which is propagated by so many zealous missionaries, will always prove a source of great danger to civilisation and humanity; it will always be necessary to be on the watch to arrest its progress.

The anti-slavery crusade and the creation of an independent Congo State have already proved powerful barriers to its later

invasions; but these are not sufficient. It is necessary to form against it a general union of all the Christian Powers.

What, then, can we say, under such circumstances, of men—even of learned Europeans, living in a Christian land—who make a display of their preference for Islam over the faith of their fathers? What can we say of those who assume the turban, and enrol themselves among the followers of Mohammed?

When we think of such things the pen falls from our hands, and we have no longer the courage to express our thoughts.

C. DE HARLEZ.

ART. II.—ROME'S TRIBUTE TO ANGLICAN ORDERS.

1. *Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders: A Defence of the Episcopal Succession and Priesthood of the Church of England founded on the Testimony of the best Roman Catholic Authorities.* By Rev. MONTAGUE BUTLER. London: Church Defence Institution, 1893.
2. *The Question of Anglican Ordinations.* Discussed by E. E. ESTCOURT, M.A., F.S.A., Canon of St. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham. London, 1873.
3. *The Anglican Ministry: Its Nature and Value in Relation to the Catholic Priesthood.* By ARTHUR WOLLASTON HUTTON, M.A. London, 1879.
4. *The Ordinal of Edward VI.: Its History, Theology, and Liturgy.* By Dom WILFRID RAYNAL, O.S.B. London, 1871.

UNDER the heading “Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders,” the Rev. Montague Butler has published a brochure on behalf of the Church Defence Institution, the object of which is to prove to the Anglican world that Rome has stamped with her approval the validity of Anglican Orders. For its own sake this work is not worth notice, for it is a persistent attempt to pervert the plain facts of English history; but for the sake of those who are likely to be victimised by a number of assertions made with any amount of assurance, the present writer was requested to make an *exposé* of this historical fraud the subject of a paper for the Historical Research Society. It is to be regretted that such replies are called for by the decline in the moral tone of modern Anglican controversy, owing to the demoralising influence of the late Dr. Littledale. In the days of the old Tractarians, Anglican controversy was a model for gentleness of manner and honesty of purpose. But some of their modern

successors are no longer humble searchers after truth, but defenders of a cause, mere advocates with a gallery to play to, and who do not disdain the tactics of an Old Bailey lawyer. Misstatements of facts that have been long ago riddled into rags, and which ought to be referred to only with an expression of regret that any Anglican writer had made use of them, are repeated as calmly as if the writers were not aware of the fact; as Pope puts it—

Who shames the scribbler? Break one cobweb through,
He spins the slight, self-pleasing thread anew:
Destroy his fib or sophistry, in vain,
The creature's at his dirty work again.

It is a weary task slaying the slain, but in the interest of the public the scribbler's fibs and sophistry must not be left without an answer.

I.

Ever since it has been drawn up, the validity of the Anglican Ordinal has been questioned. Age after age has the Catholic Church recorded her earnest conviction in her practice. Two Anglican bishops and hundreds of Anglican clergy have asked for admission into her fold. In every case when any such have sought admission to her ministry it has always been on the same condition, they must enter as laymen. On her own showing, if she admitted there was even a doubt as to the invalidity of Anglican Orders, such a course would convict her of sacrilege. To attempt to show that she has ever acted in such a way as to convict herself of this great crime, would be a waste of labour. Yet such seems to be the attempt made by the author of "Rome's Tribute." He seeks to show that the Roman Church has committed herself to a theory which she rejects in practice. The public might well have hoped that after all that has been written on the point, the main historical facts are now agreed upon, and that the only dispute can be as to their value. This tract, however, proves that this expectation is in vain. The hopeless way in which the Rev. Montague Butler mixes up the Edwardine Bishops deposed in Mary's reign with the Catholic Bishops confirmed by Pole in their sees, shows that he has not grasped the elementary historical facts upon which he undertakes to enlighten the

public, and that the work of laborious and conscientious writers has been thrown away.

In order to understand what follows, it is necessary to remind the reader that by the time Edward VI. ascended the throne Cranmer had quite given up his faith in the real presence, the sacrifice of the mass, and the sacramental character of Holy Orders. He had adopted the view set forth in the 25th Article, that Holy Orders was "not a sacrament," and "has not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God." If, then, Holy Orders is no longer to be considered a sacrament in the new dispensation, it followed that it conferred no sacramental grace or sacrificial character, and that the new ministers had no more power to confer Christian sacraments *ex opere operato* than the parish clerk. As the old Pontificals, which had been in use in this country since its conversion to Christianity, were drawn up on the principle that Holy Orders was a sacrament, which conferred a sacramental grace and sacrificial character on the recipient, and were used as the *forms* by which this sacramental grace and sacrificial character were imparted, it became necessary to draw up new forms for appointing ministers, in order that the new rite might conform to the new doctrine. Accordingly, the forms for consecrating bishops and priests contained in the old Pontificals were put on one side and a "new sort and fashion of orders," now known as the Ordinal of Edward VI., was drawn up according to Cranmer's Calvinistic notions, and legalised A.D. 1550.

Six reformers were consecrated by the new Ordinal, and given English sees—viz., Harley was given Hereford; Taylor, Lincoln; Hooper, Gloucester; Scory, Chichester; the infamous Poynet was intruded into Winchester, Gardiner the lawful bishop being still living; and Coverdale was given Exeter. Ferrar, another reformer, had been consecrated in September 1548 to St. David's. The new form had not then been legalised, and was not therefore used, but, as Collier remarks, "his consecration was not altogether according to the old form." Mr. Butler undertakes the Quixotic task of persuading Anglicans, unlearned in English Ecclesiastical History, that Cardinal Pole and several Popes recognised the Episcopal Orders of these men and confirmed them in their sees. With what success and by what means will appear in the sequel.

II. WHAT ROME'S TRIBUTE TO ANGLICAN ORDERS REALLY WAS.

Queen Mary ascended the throne July 19, A.D. 1553. The reform movement had by this time practically killed itself. The shameless scrambling after the goods of the Church, the open and disgraceful profligacy of reforming prelates like Poynet and Holgate, an example that was followed by the bulk of the lesser reforming clergy, had revolted and disgusted the religious-minded portion of the people, and alienated their sympathies from the new religion established by Cranmer. The feeling on all sides was, Down with it, even to the ground. Even such a one-sided writer as Burnet testifies to this fact.

The untimely death of King Edward [he writes] was looked upon by all people as a just judgment of God upon those who pretended to love and promote a reformation, but whose impious and flagitious lives were a reproach to it. The open lewdness in which many lived without shame or remorse gave great occasion to our adversaries to say that they were right to assert justification by faith without works, since they were as to every good reprobate. Their gross and insatiable scrambling after the goods and wealth that had been dedicated with good designs, though to superstitious uses, without applying part of it to the promoting the Gospel, the instructing of youth, and relieving the poor, made all people conclude that it was for Robbery, not for Reformation, that their zeal made them so active.*

And again, their

irregular and immoral lives gave their enemies great advantages to say they ran away from confession, penance, fasting, and prayer, only that they might be under no restraint and indulge themselves in a licentious and dissolute life. . . . The people grew to look on all the changes that had been made as designs to enrich some vicious courtiers, and let in an inundation of vice and wickedness upon the nation.†

This being the popular feeling, it is not to be wondered at that Queen Mary's first Parliament proceeded at once to sweep away the whole of Cranmer's ecclesiastical legislation. The second statute, ch. ii., amongst other things, lays down—

In consideration whereof, be it enacted and established . . . that an Act made for the ordering of ministers . . . and every clause, sentence, and branch, article and articles mentioned, expressed or con-

* "History," &c., iii. p. 216.

+ *Ibid.* iii. p. 217.

tained in the said statutes and in every one of them, shall be from henceforth utterly repelled, void, adnichillate, and of no effect, to all purposes, contencions and intents.*

The legal status of the reforming clergy was thus gone. This action of Parliament, be it remembered, was not taken at the instance of the Roman Curia, it was the spontaneous act of the English people. It was the *vox populi* giving expression through their representatives of their conviction that the new clergy were not possessed of the grace of Holy Orders, and therefore not qualified to officiate at the altars of the English Church. Upon this the Queen takes action. In order that sacrilege and profanation of religious rites might not continue, she addressed a letter to Bonner, Bishop of London, dated March 3, 1554, in which she takes for granted that the invalidity of the "new sort and fashion of orders" was so unquestionable that it was not necessary to wait for the arrival of the Pope's legate, and that the matter required to be dealt with without delay. Accordingly, in her letter she directs, art. 15 :

Item, touching such persons as were heretofore promoted to any orders after the new sort and fashion of orders, considering that they are *not ordered in very deed*, the bishop of the diocese, finding otherwise sufficiency and ability in these men, may supply that thing which wanted in them before and then according to his discretion admit them to minister.†

This official document is valuable evidence. It testifies, not to the personal views of the Queen, but to those of her legal advisers, and embodies the views of contemporary witnesses, who had every opportunity of knowing the facts of the case, as to the religious status of those ordained according to the Ordinal of Edward VI. Their view was that such men were not really in orders at all, and that the bishop must supply what was wanting in them before he admitted them to officiate. This letter was followed by prompt measures. Commissions were issued (see Rymer, xv. 70) for proceeding against the new Protestant prelates, dated March, A.D. 1554, which resulted in their deposition. The sentence upon Taylor, Hooper, and Harley is given in Burnet as follows :

* "Statutes of the Realm," 1st Mary, st. 2, c. ii., vol. iv. p. 1.

† Collier, vi. p. 64, ed. 1852.

The register of Canterbury, in which all these deprivations are recorded, testifieth that on the 20th March, 1554, the Bishops of Winchester, London, Chichester, and Durham, by virtue of the Queen's commission directed to them, pronounced the sentence of deprivation upon John Taylor, Bishop of Lincoln, *ob nullitatem consecrationis ejus et defectum tituli sui quem habuit a Rege Edwardo Sixto per literas patentes cum hoc clausula dum bene se gesserit*, upon John Hooper, Bishop of Winchester and Gloucester, *propter conjugium et alia mala merita et vitiosum titulum ut supra* upon John Harlowe, Bishop of Hereford, *propter conjugium et heresim ut supra*.*

Scory and Ferrar had been deprived already as well as Coverdale who fled the country, and Poynet who had to make way for Gardiner, the rightful Bishop of Winchester.† The decision in the case of Taylor, that his consecration was null and his title defective, would, of course, apply to the cases of all those who were consecrated under the same conditions, and who held episcopal sees on the strength of their consecration by the Ordinal of Edward VI. If such a consecration was null in one case, it was null in all. When, therefore, Cardinal Pole landed in England, on the 12th of the following November, there were not left any prelates of the "new sort and fashion of orders" in possession of any English See for him to deal with. And the fact, that he confirmed the action of the English bishops in thus dealing with the bishops and clergy of the new learning renders it more than probable that they acted under his instructions, for he had already been appointed by Pope Julius III. legate *a latere* to the English Court, with full power to deal with the whole situation. Bonner certainly had been privately absolved and given faculties, for otherwise there would have been no bishop holding faculties in England. Both Canterbury and York were vacant, and this explains the prominent post assigned to Bonner in dealing with the clergy.

The *status* of the clergy in England at the time was four-fold. (1) There were the bishops and clergy who had been consecrated or ordained in the time of Henry VIII. before the

* Vol. ii. p. 441, editor's note (46).

† Exeter was restored to Voysey, the lawful bishop, by Royal licence, Sept. 28, 1553; Chichester was restored to Day in like manner, March 18, 1554; Winchester was restored to Gardiner, Aug. 9, 1553; St. David's was given to Morgan, April 1, 1554. The intruders, Coverdale, Scory, Poynet, and Ferrar, were deprived.

schism according to the full rites of the old Pontifical, and whose orders had been therefore both *rightly* and *legitimately* conferred. Bishops Gardiner of Winchester and Tunstall of Durham were so consecrated. (2) There were those who had been ordered during the schism, still with the full rites of the old Pontifical, and whose orders, though *rightly*, were not *legitimately*, conferred. Thirlby of Norwich, and others mentioned later on, were in this position. (3) There were those cases in which the old Pontifical had indeed been used, but with certain mutilations, such as the omission of the tradition of the instruments common in the first two years of Edward VI.'s reign. Ferrar of St. David's is a case in point. His consecration, Collier tells us, "had not been altogether according to the old form."* (4) There were those whose orders had been conferred altogether after the "new sort and fashion of orders." We cannot have a better tribute to the validity of these different classes of orders than is to be found in the instructions issued by the Holy See to Cardinal Pole as to how he is to deal with them.

Cardinal Pole had been appointed legate and received his faculties by a brief dated August 5, A.D. 1553, but as these proved insufficient to meet the circumstances of the case, a second brief, with enlarged faculties and power to delegate as well as use them out of the kingdom, was issued, dated March 8, A.D. 1554. The brief clearly recognises the four classes of clergy already mentioned.

(1) It speaks of those "*rightly and legitimately* promoted and ordained before their fall into heresy." These had only to be dispensed from the censures incurred by their schism and heresy. The dispensation issued to Bishop Tunstall of Durham expressly recites the fact that he had been confirmed in his bishopric by the authority of the Holy See. (2) It speaks of those "who had received orders or the office of consecration from other bishops or archbishops, even heretics and schismatics, and in other respects *unduly*." Such orders were treated as valid, though irregular, "provided that the *form* and *intention* of the Church had been preserved."† We have the

* Part ii. book iv. No. 266.

† Both briefs are given in Dodd's "Church History," vol. ii. appendix xxii.

dispensations granted to several diocesan bishops and suffragans consecrated during the schism under Henry VIII., before the new Anglican Ordinal had been drawn up. Thirlby of Norwich, for instance, is granted absolution "even on account of the undue detention of the church of Norwich and its revenues, and his receiving whatever orders and the gift of consecration from heretical and schismatical bishops, and in other respects *unduly* (*alias minus rite*)," and Pole dispenses him; so that, notwithstanding the irregularity thereby incurred, he "may exercise all the orders received as aforesaid, even *unduly*, and may be appointed to any cathedral church as bishop, and may use the gift of consecration as aforesaid." *

Day, Bishop of Chichester, is dispensed and absolved in much the same terms "to exercise even the sacred orders and the priesthood received as aforesaid from heretical and schismatical bishops *even unduly*, provided that the *form* and *intention* of the Church had been preserved."† Aldridge of Carlisle, Salcot of Sarum, Hethe of Worcester, Kitchin of Llandaff, King of Oxford, and Bonner of London, had all been consecrated during the schism under Henry VIII., but by the form in the old Pontificals, and in each case their orders and consecrations are said to have been "received from heretical bishops and in other respects *unduly*." The clause then in the Pope's brief, *alias minus rite*, was clearly understood to describe those who had been consecrated during the schism before the Ordinal of Edward VI. had come into existence, and Dr. Lee and other Anglican writers are as clearly wrong in supposing that it refers to those in Anglican Orders. These documents tell us who are included under this clause. There are also given in the same Register the dispensations granted to Shaxton as suffragan. He is allowed to exercise episcopal functions with the consent of his bishop. Holgate, however, is not allowed to exercise episcopal functions, whilst Hodgekin is interdicted and suspended. The reason for this distinction was that the two latter, though real Catholic bishops, were friars, members of religious orders, who had presumed to marry in defiance of their religious vows.

* "Regist. Exped.," vol. i. p. 2.

[No. 8 of Fourth Series.]

† *Ibid.*, fol. 47.

(3) It speaks of those who had been *ordered irregularly and without observing the usual form of the Church*. These also the Cardinal had power to "rehabilitate" if on examination he found the form used sufficient for a valid ordination. But on examination of the facts he evidently came to the conclusion that no orders could be recognised which had not been conferred according to the "old form"; for in his delegation of extraordinary faculties to the bishops he expressly limits such recognition to those cases in which "the form and intention of the Church had *been preserved*." Ferrar is a case in point. He had been consecrated not altogether "after the old form," and when he was degraded before his execution his episcopal character was ignored. He had previously been deprived. (4) It speaks of those who exercised orders "*which they had never received*." The brief also speaks of bishops "on whom the gift of consecration has been heretofore conferred," and also of "*those upon whom it is not conferred*." Who were these latter? The action of the English bishops in dealing with Taylor and others who had been put aside on account of the *nullity* of consecration leaves no doubt that it referred to those who had been ordered according to the new "sort and fashion" of orders, and the same is made clear by the action of Cardinal Pole in the case of Hooper, who had been consecrated bishop by the "new form." Before his execution he was degraded only from the priesthood, his episcopal character being treated as *null*, whereas in the case of Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer they were degraded from the episcopate, as they had been consecrated by the "old form." Of the commission granted to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury for reconciling the clergy and laity of that province Collier says :

This instrument extends to the absolving of all persons who repent their miscarriages and desire to be restored from all heresies, schisms, apostacies, from all excommunications, suspensions and other ecclesiastical censures; and more particularly the clergy, who had received orders from any schismatical and heretical bishop, officiated in virtue of that character, and complied with any unallowed ceremonies and forms of prayer are absolved, provided the *form* and *intention* of the Church had not been omitted in their ordination.*

The insertion of this proviso in all delegations of faculties expressly limits all reconciliations and rehabilitations to cases where the form in the old English Pontificals had been used, and excludes those cases where the new Anglican Ordinal, in which the *form* and *intention* of the Church were omitted, was used.

When Pole landed in England, as has been already said, all those who had been consecrated bishops during the schism under Edward VI. had been deprived of their sees: Taylor, Hooper, Ferrar, and Harley expressly on account of *nullity of consecration*. He was not therefore called upon to exercise in their regard his extraordinary faculties to deal with bishops "on whom it (the gift of consecration) is not conferred." The brief divides those holding episcopal offices in England into (1) those who had received the gift of consecration, and (2) those who had not. As there was no bishop in England who had not been consecrated either by the old Pontifical or the Ordinal of Edward VI. it is clear from the action of Pole and the other English bishops in their dealing with Taylor, Hooper, Ferrar, and Harley that the clause "those upon whom it (the gift of consecration) is not conferred" was understood to describe those who had received Anglican episcopal orders. The same fact comes out in Bonner's action in the case of Scory, who had been intruded into the see of Bishop Day of Chichester, on the strength of his Anglican episcopal orders. Upon his repentance and submission to the Church he received a certificate from Bonner allowing him to say mass and act as a priest in the diocese of London. Burnet tells us that Scory "came before Bonner and renounced his wife and did penance for it, and had his absolution under his seal the 14th day of July this year," A.D. 1554, and he intitles the certificate "Bonner's certificate that Bishop Scory had put away his wife."* Moreover, Bonner says expressly that he restores Scory "quatenus *de jure* possimus." Bonner knew very well that *de jure* he could only deal with Scory as a priest. An ordinary bishop has no jurisdiction in the case of fellow-bishops except in virtue of special faculties. Such cases are reserved to the Primate. Now, had Bonner received any special faculties to deal with episcopal cases? Certainly not. The right to deal with

* Vol. v. p. 359.

bishops was expressly reserved to the Pope's legate in the faculties granted for reconciling the clergy. Bonner had been one of the commissioners who had deprived Taylor on account of the "nullity of his consecration," and Scory was exactly in the same position, and Bonner's faculties only allowed him to deal with priests in whose ordination the *form* and *intention* of the Church had not been omitted. It is true that out of courtesy he gives Scory the title of "formerly Bishop of Chichester," because legally he had a right to it, but nothing more. Ridley had been intruded into Bonner's see of London in the same way that Scory had been intruded into Day's see of Chichester, and for Bonner to have admitted that Scory was in any sense really Bishop of Chichester would have been to cast doubt upon his own right to the See of London, about the last thing Bonner was likely to do. On the other hand, the cases of Holgate, Archbishop of York, and Hodgekin, Suffragan of Bedford, who were apostate friars, and had been consecrated by the form in the old English Pontifical, were dealt with by Pole himself. He grants them certificates as Bonner did to Scory, but suspends them from exercising pontifical functions.* Here we see the line clearly drawn between those consecrated by the "old form" and the "new form." The former are treated as bishops and dealt with by the Pope's legate. The latter are treated as simple priests, and dealt with by the bishop.

We are also in possession of clear evidence as to how the lesser Edwardine clergy were dealt with. In 1554, Bourne, Bishop of Bath and Wells, issued the following commission to his Vicar-General :

To remove, deprive, reform, correct and punish those who were intruded into ecclesiastical benefices and married clerics, and also to deal with married laics, who, on pretence and under colour of priestly orders, had rashly and unlawfully mingled themselves in ecclesiastical rights and had obtained *de facto* parochial churches with cure of souls and ecclesiastical dignities, against the sacred sanctions of the canons and ecclesiastical rights, and to deprive and remove them from the said churches and dignities.†

* See Dispensation from Card. Pole to John Hodgekin, of the Order of Preachers, "Regist. Exped.," vol. ii. fol. 45 b.

† Strype, "Memorials," vol. iii. part i. p. 352.

These "married laics" professed to have received orders of some kind. The term could not refer to those who had been ordained during the schism under Henry VIII., else they would have been styled "married clerics," and been allowed in their reconciliation with the Church and separation from their wives to have retained their benefices. It can therefore only refer to those who had received Anglican Orders. A clearer case still is that of George Marsh. In 1555 he was brought before the Earl of Derby and was asked :

Whether he was a priest? I said, no. Then he asked me, what had been my living. I answered I was a minister, served a cure and taught a school. Then said my lord to his council, "This is a wonderful thing. Afore he said he was no priest, and now he confesseth himself to be one." I answered, *by the laws now used in this realm*, as far as I know, I am none. Then they asked me who gave me orders, or whether I had taken any at all. I answered, I received orders of the Bishop of London and Lincoln, &c.*

Here is a case of a man who had received Anglican Orders, and states plainly that *by the laws now used in this realm* he was not a priest, but only a lay minister—*i.e.*, the "married laic" of Bourne. This, then, was the principle laid down by Pole, acting under instructions from Pope Julius III. Orders conferred by the old English Pontificals were held to be valid. Orders conferred by the Ordinal of Edward VI., otherwise known as Anglican Orders, were held to be null and void. An eminent theologian hence draws this conclusion :

The controversy seems then to have been closed when under the Catholic Queen Mary, who happily succeeded her heretical brother, anno 1553, Reginald Pole being Cardinal and acting as legate of the Holy See, all the ordinations of bishops made during the preceding reign of Edward were held to be null.†

Another important Roman tribute to the invalidity of Anglican Orders is furnished by Pope St. Pius V. Before issuing the Bull *Regnans in cælis* excommunicating Elizabeth, Pope St. Pius V. ordered a process to be drawn up when evidence was taken as to the Queen's proceedings. Amongst the points upon which evidence was taken the seventh interrogatory

* Foxe, fol. vii. p. 41.

† Gazzaniga, "Prælect. Theol.," Dis. viii. c. iv. § 112. Venice, 1803.

was "whether by her authority any schismatics were constituted bishops and rectors, *not being priests.*" Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, Henry Henshaw, late Rector of Lincoln College, and Edmund Daniel, late Dean of Hereford, testify that the persons intruded into the Sees of the deprived Catholic bishops were heretics, and some of them *not priests.* Henry Morton, a priest of York, is more explicit. He deposes: "I know, moreover, that there are some bishops who are *mere laymen*, amongst whom is Lincoln" (Nicholas Bullingham). William Allot also deposes that he knows Nicholas Bullingham well and is on friendly terms with him, and "I know he is *not a priest.*" Thomas Kirton, a priest of Salisbury, deposes also that he knows Jewel, and "the public opinion is that some others were promoted and made bishops by the authority of the Queen, as it is publicly believed in these parts, who were *not priests*, as was the Bishop of Lincoln." In the declaratory sentence annexed to the process by St. Pius V. he declares that Queen Elizabeth had conferred "bishoprics, benefices, and other dignities upon schismatics and heretics who *were not clerics.*" * Supposing, then, Bullingham and others, who are described as "not clerics," to have received Anglican Orders,† we have here a distinct avowal on the part of Rome of the invalidity of such orders.

A still more decided tribute to the invalidity of Anglican Orders on the part of Rome is to be found in the decision of the Holy Office in the case of John Clement Gordon, Anglican Bishop of Galloway. When the Right Rev. Dr. Ives, Anglican Bishop of North Carolina, came to Rome to be reconciled to the Church, 1844, this decree was produced from the Archives, as bearing upon his case. Gordon having made his submission to the Holy See and being desirous of ordination, submitted his case to the Holy Office, when the whole question of Anglican Orders was examined historically, canonically, and theologically, and the following was the decision—viz., a decree of the Pope himself, dated April 17, 1704 :

* The whole process may be seen in Ladecharius, "Contin. of Baronius," vol. iii. pp. 197-210.

† There is no reason to doubt that Bullingham had received Anglican Episcopal Orders. He was consecrated Dec. 21, 1559. (See Collier, 6, p. 292.)

In the general Congregation of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition held in the Apostolic Palace at St. Peter's, in the presence of our Most Holy Lord Clement XI., by Divine Providence Pope; and the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Lords the Cardinals of the Most Holy Roman Church deputed by the Holy Apostolic See. . . . The aforesaid Memorial being read, our Most Holy Lord, the aforesaid Pope, having heard the sentiments of the same eminent personages, decreed that the aforesaid petitioner, John Clement Gordon, be promoted from *the commencement* to all, even the Holy Orders and the Priesthood, and that, as he had not been fortified by the Sacrament of Confirmation, he be confirmed.

And the following were the reasons given in the decree for this decision :

That they (Anglican Orders) should be pronounced valid, it would be necessary to show, not on doubtful but on certain evidence, that the true character of the Episcopate is possessed by these pretended Anglican Bishops; that they have received, by succession from the Catholic Church, a legitimate ordination and consecration; and that, in fine, the essential *form, matter, and intention* has been and is now adopted by these pseudo-bishops in their consecration. For, if any of these three things be wanting, to wit, character, legitimate consecration, form or intention, it must be admitted with all theologians that the consecration is null and void. . . . But it cannot be granted that they have received the ministry from Catholics, since *no evidence* is produced of successive ordination. Without this, there remains no other vestige of consecration with these heretics besides the ministry derived from the people or a lay prince. Moreover, supposing even that some one of them had received, by means of legitimate succession, the episcopal ordination and consecration (which, however, is by no means proved), still their Orders *must be pronounced INVALID*, through the defect of matter, form and due intention. For they use no matter, except the delivery of the Bible; no legitimate form; they have rejected the Catholic form and changed it into this—"Receive the power of preaching the word of God and of administering holy sacraments"—which *essentially* differs from the orthodox forms. Besides, what intention can be formed by those who deny that Christ or the Primitive Church instituted any unbloody sacrifice? Without a sacrifice there is *no priest*; without a priest, there is no bishop; without either there is, as St. Jerome says, no church, faith, or gospel. In fine, the *constant practice* in England has always been to treat every heretical minister returning to the bosom of the Church as a *lay person*. Hence, if he be engaged in matrimony, he continues in the same; if he be free and wishes to enter the ecclesiastical state, he is ordained like other Catholics; or if he prefer it he may marry a wife. Therefore, &c. &c.*

* *Notes and Queries*, vol. i. p. 131, 1836, where the decree is given in full.

Those who know with what care such matters are investigated at Rome will understand the importance of this decree. But what are we to think of a writer who, in the face of this decree of the Roman Pontiff, can jauntily assert, "It is well worthy of remark that the Roman Church has never publicly and authoritatively defined that Anglican Orders are invalid." *

Mr. Hutton, in his valuable work on the "Anglican Ministry," seems to think that this decree cannot claim the character of a formal and final decision. But as he refers to Estcourt, who does not give the whole *expositio*, but only the clause of the decree deciding Gordon's particular case, he seems not to have seen the whole document. The statement of the principles upon which this particular case is decided is so strong and clear, that it is not easy to see on what ground this judgment is not to be considered formal and final. The Roman Courts would certainly not take that view of the matter, and there can be no doubt that this decree was appealed to by the Roman authorities in the case of Bishop Ives as a formal and final settlement of the whole question.

III. WHAT ROME'S TRIBUTE TO ANGLICAN ORDERS REALLY WAS NOT.

After such public and authoritative pronouncements on the invalidity of Anglican Orders by Rome, whose motto is *semper eadem*, it might have been supposed that, having once put down her foot, any attempt to prove that she had gone back of her word, or that her voice had ever given an uncertain sound, was about as hopeless as an attempt to square the circle. After the merciless exposure which old hackneyed Anglican legends on this question have met with, after the masterly way in which they have had the life knocked out of them by careful and exact historians, such as, *e.g.*, Canon Estcourt, it was not too much to have expected that they would have been relegated for the rest of time to the limbo of exploded fables, and that their ghosts would trouble the earth no more. Alas! no. In the person of Rev. Montague R. Butler, Church defenders have found a champion equal to the occasion, who has undertaken

* "Rome's Tribute," &c., p. 6.

to prove to the world that Rome has never condemned Anglican Orders, but on the whole rather approves of them, and even assures the Establishment the possession of them. Modern Church defenders seem to have adopted the reprehensible principle laid down by the late Dr. Littledale. When charged with saying things that he well knew were not strictly true, he defended himself on the following grounds: "Knowing how hard it is to drive ideas into untutored minds, I have been compelled to aim primarily at *incisiveness* and to omit *all qualifications* of leading propositions which I could and would use in fuller writing for a more learned class of readers."* In other words, for the sake of *incisiveness*, and in order to impress *untutored minds*, he admits that he tampers with truth by deliberately making misleading statements, which he would not make to tutored minds. It is only on some such ground that we can explain the appearance of such tracts as "Rome's 'Tribute to Anglican Orders.'" Here we have all the old exploded fairy tales of Anglican controversy trotted out, without a hint to the untutored mind that their truth has ever been questioned, or that they have been labelled as spurious by the best modern writers. Canon Bright has already warned Anglican Church defenders of the folly of such a policy. "Clergymen," he says, "who are interested in the literary aspects of Church defence will do well to discourage *imaginative reconstructions* of our old Church history which may seem to support the anti-Papal contention, but really gives advantage to a fairly informed Roman arguer."† In spite of this warning, untutored minds have to be impressed, and so we have such works as the one under review. It is hardly possible to suppose that the writers are not fully aware how flimsy, irrelevant and historically worthless their assertions are.

If they are so, they must pay the penalty of being found out and forfeiting the public confidence they have tried to practise on. If they are not, they have no business to handle such questions at all.

The writer hopes in the sequel to be able to justify these somewhat severe strictures.

* "Rejoinder," *Contemporary Review*, May 1880.

† *Church Times*, Dec. 17, 1888.

SECTION II. ANSWERED.

Rome's alleged tribute to Anglican Orders in this section consists of three points: (1) The action of the Council of Trent; (2) the asserted summoning of Anglican bishops *as such* to the council; (3) the speech of Bishop O'Harte of Achonry. A word upon each.

(1) "As a matter of fact it is alleged that they (the Fathers at Trent) distinctly refused to pronounce the English bishops to be no bishops."* What really happened was this. In June 1553, if Pallavicini be correct,† some Belgian theologians arrived at Trent and informed the Council of the steps taken by Elizabeth to destroy the ancient faith in England. The indignation of the Council was extreme, and it was proposed at once to issue a sentence excommunicating the Queen, and it was suggested, and the suggestion was approved of by Pope Pius IV., that, as the Fathers were engaged in discussing what constituted a legitimate bishop, a clause should be inserted "that those appointed by the Queen were not bishops." It was hoped that this sentence would induce the Catholic princes to take action. But the Emperor's ambassadors interfered, and by his advice the matter was dropped. The reason given for not proceeding with the matter was that such a step would only exasperate the Queen "against the few bishops who remained in England." It is not easy to see what tribute to their Orders Anglicans can extract from this incident, even if it is correctly given by Pallavicini. The Pope and the assembled bishops were of opinion that a sentence should issue declaring that Anglican prelates were not bishops. They were persuaded to shelve the matter, not by reason of any difference of opinion in the Council, but purely on grounds of political expediency, lest it might cause the death of those few bishops who remained in England. There were still seven of the old hierarchy living. These are the only ones recognised by the Council as being bishops. The very existence of bishops of the Queen's making is ignored, and the Council was prepared,

* "Rome's Tribute," &c., p. 6.

† "History of the Council of Trent" (Latin version), xxi. ch. vii. p. 3.

if left to itself, to declare that these prelates were "not bishops." A truly striking tribute to Anglican Orders!

There is, however, some doubt as to the accuracy of Pallavicini's statement. The late Canon Estcourt, who carefully examined all the documentary evidence, writes:

When I was in Rome in 1856 I had leave from the Fathers of the Society of Jesus to look through Pallavicini's collections, and I found the papers he refers to on this point. There is a proposal which seems to have come from the English exiles, and another paper marked "B," the source of which is left in the dark. Both these papers propose to excommunicate and deprive the Queen, but there is not a word in either of them referring to the Anglican bishops. The question was referred to the Pope, and there is a letter from St. Charles Borromeo conveying the Pope's approval of its being done. But the Emperor's ambassadors had written to him, and he at once interfered and stopped it, and especially on the ground that the excommunication of the Queen would lead to harsher measures against the Catholic bishops in England, perhaps to their being put to death. There is their letter to him and his reply. I have copies of all these papers. I cannot account for Pallavicini's statement about the Anglican bishops, and believe it to be an error. I cannot find anything to support it in Paleotti's *Acts of the Council*, nor in those lately published by Theiner.*

Mr. Butler tells us further: "He (the Pope) had invited the English prelates *as bishops* to join in the deliberations of the Council." No authority can be produced for this assertion that Anglican prelates were offered a seat or a vote in the Council.

This assertion is a pure invention. English prelates were not invited to the Council *as bishops*, or as anything else. No communication took place between the Pope and the English prelates. Their very existence as real bishops was ignored by the Pope and the Council. Collier tells us that what really happened was this:

The said Pope Pius IV. renewed his attempt to gain the Queen, and gave her an invitation, with other Protestant princes, to the Council of Trent, and despatched Abbot Martinengo towards England with letters of a very smooth content. Amongst other matters, he acquainted her that, if she would please to send either bishops or ambassadors to the Council, he did not question giving them such satisfaction as might open the way for further accommodation.†

* Hutton's "Anglican Ministry," p. 133.

† Collier, vol. vi. p. 330.

If English prelates had gone to the Council, they would have gone, not as Catholic bishops, but as envoys of a Protestant sovereign, and would have been treated as the envoys of other Protestant princes. It was the practice to invite such persons to appear *before* the Council, in order that they might be able to make any representation on behalf of their prince that he might wish to lay before the assembled bishops; but they were not allowed a seat or a vote in the Council. Besides, if English prelates had been invited, as bishops, they would have received a formal summons, the same as other Catholic bishops, and this they most certainly never received.

We are further assured that (3) Bishop O'Harte, of Achonry, asserted that the Elizabethan prelates "*show that they were called, elected, consecrated, and given mission.*"* Now, a reference to what this Bishop really said will show that he pointedly avoids all reference to Elizabethan prelates. He is speaking on the question of jurisdiction, not of Orders, and his words are :

Thus in England the *King* calls himself head of the Church, and creates bishops, who are consecrated by three bishops, and say they are true bishops as being from God. But we deny this, because they have not been acknowledged by the Roman Pontiff, and we are right in saying this, and by this one argument and no other we convict them; for (apart from this) they themselves show that they have been called, elected, consecrated, sent.†

How can these words be twisted into a tribute to Anglican Orders? O'Harte is speaking exclusively of Henry VIII.'s bishops, who had been consecrated before the Anglican Ordinal had been invented, and whose lawful jurisdiction only was in question, but whose valid Orders were not questioned by any one. He pointedly avoids the whole question of the position of the Queen's prelates. No Anglican consecration took place in Ireland till 1563, a year after O'Harte's speech in the Council; he had therefore had no personal experience of the mode of conferring them.

Besides, Bishop O'Harte could not have been ignorant of how any departure from the form of consecration in the old Pontificals was dealt with, in the case of Bishop Casey, the only

* "Rome's Tribute," &c., p. 7.

† Le Plat, "Monum. ad Hist. Conc. Trident," tom. v. p. 578.

instance that had occurred of an Edwardine prelate in Ireland. He belonged to the diocese of Cashel, but went up to Dublin to be consecrated by the reformers—Browne, Archbishop of Dublin; Thos. Lancaster of Kildare, who does not appear to have been consecrated himself till A.D. 1568; and others. The consecration took place October 25, 1551. The Ordinal of Edward VI. had not then been legalised, and he appears to have been consecrated, like Ferrar, not altogether after the old form. About A.D. 1556 he made his submission before David Wolfe, the Apostolic Commissary, and was reconciled to the Church as a priest, his episcopal character being treated as null. The following are the terms of his submission :

I, William Cahessy, *priest*, sometime bishop of the diocese of Kildare, yet nothing canonically consecrated, but by the schismatical authority of Edward, King of England, schismatically preferred to the bishopric of Limerick aforesaid, wherein I confess to have offended my Creator, &c. &c.*

There is not the most remote reference in O'Harte's speech to Elizabethan prelates. No such prelates had any existence in Ireland at the time. The only real Edwardine prelate that had appeared on the scene had been turned out of his see and reduced to the position of a simple priest. The King's (Henry VIII.'s) bishops were the only ones in Ireland whom the Irish bishops had to deal with, and O'Harte informs the Council of the view taken in Ireland of their position. In the whole of this section, therefore, there is not a single fact which can be twisted by the most perverse ingenuity into a tribute to Anglican Orders.

SECTIONS III. AND IV. ANSWERED.

Here we have Cardinal Newman censured for his repudiation of Anglican Orders, on the ground that he ignores the fact "that they were *in some sense* acquiesced in by the wit of Popes Julius III., Paul IV., Pius IV., Pius V., Urban VIII., and Innocent XII."† This is a formidable statement if it could only be substantiated. Let us see what truth there is in it. Cardinal Pole served Anglican prelates much as Queen

* "The Episcopal Succession," vol. iii. p. 27. Maziere Brady.

† "Rome's Tribute," &c., p. 8.

Elizabeth served them when she ordered them "to be packing; she was no atheist, but she knew full well that they were only *hedge priests*."* No Anglican prelate was allowed by Pole to hold any English see. As we have seen, they were one and all sent about their business before his arrival in England, with his knowledge and approval. Julius III. confirmed what had been done, and this constitutes his tribute to Anglican Orders. But, at all events, Mr. Butler goes on:

Dr. Saunders testifies that the Anglican Episcopal Orders, which were officially recognised and confirmed under Papal authority by Cardinal Pole, received additional recognition from another occupant of the Holy See, and were established and confirmed afterwards by the letters of Pope Paul IV.†

For this quotation we are referred to book ii., no chapter or page being given. Nothing of the kind can be found in Saunders. This passage is only a spurious addition of some unknown editor of a later edition, and the term Anglican Episcopal Orders is dragged in quite gratuitously by Mr. Butler. It is not in the text.

When Mary ascended the throne the following Anglican prelates, who had been consecrated by the Anglican ordination service under Edward VI., held office on the strength of their Anglican Episcopal Orders: Harley held Hereford; Taylor, Lincoln; Hooper, Gloucester; Ferrar, St. David's; Scory, Chichester; and Poynet, Winchester. All these were deprived of their sees—Taylor, Hooper, Harley, and Ferrar by Royal Commission and expressly on account of *nullity* of consecration. The sentence upon Taylor records that fact, and in the cases of Harley and Hooper the sentence on Taylor is referred to as holding good as regards them—*ut supra*, it says—and in the case of Ferrar, *propter causas supradictas*. Scory had to make way for the lawful bishop Day, Poynet for Gardiner, and Coverdale for Voysey. Not only so, but these sees were filled up with real Catholic bishops consecrated according to the "old form." Hereford was given to Wharton, Lincoln to White, Gloucester to Brookes, St. David's to Morgan, Chichester to Day, Winchester to Gardiner, and Exeter to Voysey.‡

* Dodd, vol. iii. p. 73.

† "Rome's Tribute," &c., p. 10.

‡ Pallavicini, ii. p. 420, 421. *Ex Act. Consist.*, July 6, 1554.

Now, Mr. Butler's thesis is that the Anglican Episcopal Orders of these seven deprived prelates, made in Edward VI.'s time, were officially recognised and confirmed under Papal authority by Cardinal Pole, and that he restored and confirmed them in their sees. A more grossly misleading and historically false statement could not be penned. Every schoolboy is supposed to know, for instance, that Hooper and Ferrar, so far from being recognised as bishops and restored to their sees, were burnt as obstinate heretics, and before their execution were degraded only from the priesthood, their Anglican Episcopal Orders being officially unrecognised. A writer who has made special study of this period remarks: "There is not a solitary instance of an Edwardine bishop, consecrated after the Protestant ritual, having been rehabilitated by Cardinal Pole or admitted to the possession of an English bishopric in Queen Mary's reign."* A clean sweep was made of all Edwardine prelates consecrated by the Edwardine Ordinal, and their places filled by real Catholic bishops. Popes Julius III. and Paul IV. confirmed the action of Pole and the English Catholic bishops in thus depriving and expelling from their sees all those in Anglican Orders, and replacing them by real Catholic bishops. The writer of "Rome's Tribute" may gather what consolation he can from these facts, but he has no right to attempt to alter the plain facts of English history to suit his own purpose. His failure to distinguish between the recognition extended to those in whose consecration the *form* and *intention* of the Church had not been omitted and the recognition refused to those in whose consecration they had been omitted is inexplicable on any ground that does not postulate either incompetence or dishonesty in the writer.

Those who desire to see the Anglican legend about Paul IV., Pius IV., and Pius V. neatly dissected and turned inside out are referred to Canon Estcourt's learned work, "Anglican Ordinations" (ch. viii.) The Anglican result is obtained by the common device of doubling and making one Pope do duty for three. Pius IV. is said to have offered to recognise the Anglican "Booke of Divine Service." This Pope has been confused with Pius V. by some, with Paul IV. by others, with the result that we have three Popes credited with the action of one. This

* "English Cath. Hierarchy," p. 25. Maziere Brady.

ingenious fable seems to have originated in this way. Judge Coke is reported to have said, in a charge delivered at Norwich Assizes, August 4, 1606, that Pius V. in a letter offered to allow the "Booke of Divine Service, as it now is used amongst us, to be authentic and not repugnant to truth." This charge has ever since been part of the stock-in-trade of Anglican controversialists, and is being quoted continually as quite decisive by the *Church Times* and other Church defenders. A reference to Coke's "Preface to the seventh part of his Law Reports" will show that he cannot find words in which to express his indignation that such a manifest forgery should be fathered upon him. He says he never wrote a word of it, calls the production shameful and shameless, and styles the author a falsary.* The fact that Pius V. is named instead of Pius IV. would of itself stamp this charge as spurious.

Bishop Andrewes of Chester says the offer was made by Paul IV. But Camden, who, owing to his relations with Cecil, was most likely to have known the truth, corrects them both, and says the offer, as "report goeth," was made by Pius IV., but not in a letter. "What matters," he says, "Papaglia propounded I find not, for I do not think his instructions were put into writing, and to rove at them with the common sort of historians I list not."† Fuller gives the same account as Camden, but adds that the report proceeds from "some (not more knowing of councils, but more daring in conjectures than others) who love to feign what they cannot find, that they may never appear to be at a loss."‡ Parsons the Jesuit, who was sure to have been correctly informed, writes :

Wherefore that which hath bene given out (as is said by some great men) that the Pope, by his letter to her Majestie, did offer to confirme the service of England uppon condition that the title of supremacie might be restored him againe, is impossible to be soe, soe that, if any such letter came to hir Majestie's handes, they must needs be fayned and false.§

And he labels the story in the margin, "A notable device."

* Coke's "Reports." Wilson, vol. iv. Preface vii. p. 5.

† "Annals," p. 34.

‡ "Church History," iv. p. 309.

§ "Brief Discourse," &c., Douay, 1580, p. 39.

The whole of this Anglican legend turns out to be a mere canard used by politicians to jockey unwary Catholics into conformity. Pius V. has left on record Rome's opinion about the Anglican movement in his time; for in the Bull *Regnans in cælis*, in which he excommunicates Elizabeth, he gives amongst his reasons for doing so the following: She had replaced the Catholic clergy by "shameless preachers and ministers of impiety," had "abolished the sacrifice of the mass, and had imposed upon her whole kingdom books containing manifest heresy," and he calls the Anglican Communion Service "a profane mystery in accordance with the system of Calvin." It was not likely that with such views about the Anglican Prayer-book Rome was at any time disposed to approve of it. The attempt to convert this alleged offer of Pius IV. to recognise the Prayer-book into an offer to recognise Anglican Orders, is only one of the tricks of modern controversy. The Anglican Ordinal was not at the time incorporated with the Prayer-book, but was a separate work, in the same way that the Missal and the Pontifical had been up to that time kept distinct. Even the original authors of this gossamer gossip say nothing about any offer to recognise Anglican Orders. That is a modern addition to the original legend. Neither Paul IV. nor Pius V. had anything whatever to do with such an offer. Camden shows that the attempt to connect them with the matter was the result of a mere blunder arising from a confusion of names. The only shred of evidence we have attributes the offer to Pius IV., and this on the strength of a report that his Nuncio Papaglia is said to have had private instructions, but what they were Camden confesses no one knows, or in fact whether he had any instructions at all or not. There is no documentary evidence on the point, and Fuller says the report was a mere invention of some who loved to feign what they could not find, so as not to appear to be at a loss.*

Urban VIII. next comes on the scene, and we are told that

* In a review of the "Calendar of Letters and State Papers relating to English Affairs preserved principally in the Archives of Simancas," vol. i. Elizabeth, 1558-1567, edited by Martin A. S. Hume, the writer says of Pius V.: "Elizabeth at least was well aware that the Pope had no intention of accepting her bishops or of authorising the Prayer-book of 1559" (*Guardian*, Aug. 30, 1893, p. 1356).

he "admitted the authority of that prelate (Laud), is shown by the fact that the Papal offer of the Cardinal's hat was twice made to Laud."* Needless to say that no evidence of any such offer on the part of the Holy See is adduced. Nor does Laud say that any such offer came from the Pope. It probably is true that the Queen Henrietta Maria, thinking to conciliate Laud's forbearance in favour of her persecuted fellow-Catholics, by showing him this mark of her goodwill, and hoping that, if she succeeded, it might lead to the conversion of the King, offered to ask for this honour to be bestowed upon him, trusting that she had sufficient influence at Rome to induce the Pope to do this for her sake. The failure of her application, and the tortuous way in which the negotiation had to be carried on, proves that Rome had no hand in the matter. The Queen's envoy was instructed to apply for a Cardinal's hat for an English subject, but not to reveal the name of the person for whom this distinction was intended until his request was granted. Young, inexperienced, and a foreigner, the Queen did not seem to realise how preposterous the proposal would sound to the Holy See to bestow a Cardinal's hat upon one who was notoriously an excommunicated schismatic and heretic, and who, moreover, stood exactly on the same ground as those Anglican prelates who in Mary's time had been removed on account of *nullity* of consecration. As Lingard has been quoted, here is what he really says :

Towards the end of August 1633, Sir Robert Douglas arrived in Rome with the character of envoy from the Queen, and a letter of credence signed by the Earl of Stirling, Secretary of State for Scotland. It was soon discovered that the real object of his mission was to obtain, through her intercession, the dignity of a Cardinal for a British subject, under the pretext that such a concession would go far towards the future conversion of the King. Urban, suspicious of some political intrigue, resolved to return no answer till he should have ascertained from whom this *unexpected* project had originated, in whose favour the hat was solicited, and with that view he deemed it expedient to despatch an envoy from Rome who might communicate personally with the Queen.†

Leander, a Benedictine monk, was first sent, and he was followed by Panzani, an Oratorian, who was instructed "on

* "Rome's Tribute," &c., p. 12.

† "History of England," vol. ix. p. 313.

no pretext whatever to allow himself to be drawn into communication with the new Archbishop of Canterbury."* This project was evidently sprung upon Rome by the English Court, and this papal offer turns out to have been a *papal refusal*. The only offer made to Laud was made later, and as it shows in what bad odour he was in Rome, and how Rome was disposed to deal with him, and as it will help the reader to form his opinion, it is as well to insert it:

We find Rosetti inquiring of Cardinal Barberini whether, if Laud should escape from the Tower the Pope would afford him an asylum and pension in Rome. He would be content with 1000 crowns. Barberini answered that Laud was in such *bad repute* in Rome, being looked upon as the cause of all the troubles in England, that it would previously be necessary that he should give *good proof* of his *repentance*, in which case he should receive assistance, though such assistance would give colour to the imputation that there had always been an understanding between him and Rome.†

From this it is clear that the Holy See had not had any negotiations with Laud, and that he was about as likely to have had the offer of a Cardinal's hat as Oliver Cromwell.

Once more we are told that Pope Innocent XII. solemnly defined that King James II. was bound to maintain the succession in the Church of England, and hence the inference. "Had His Holiness held the English episcopate and priesthood to be invalid or sacrilegious, this judgment would of course have been impossible."‡ Now, what are the real facts of the case? Sancroft, the nonjuring ex-Archbishop of Canterbury, asked James II., whom he still regarded as the lawful head of his Church, though a Roman Catholic, to sanction the consecration of two nonjuring bishops by way of continuing the nonjuring succession. This act would be one of hostility to the Established Church over which now William and Mary were supreme. James consulted the Archbishop of Paris and Bossuet. They answered that he was "under no obligation to act against the Established Church." James also consulted Pope Innocent XII., who is said to have answered "to the same effect." So far from defining that James was bound to

* "History of England," vol. ix. p. 314.

† *Ibid.*, vol. x. p. 139, note.

‡ "Rome's Tribute," &c., p. 13.

maintain and defend the Anglican succession, the Pope answered that he, in this case, was not bound to interfere in the matter. Only one more unhistorical assertion remains to be noticed. It is this : "That in the Visitation of 1559, although there were 10,000 clergy, only the small number of 180 refused to accept the reformed offices."* Fortunately, we have amongst the State papers the return made by the visitors, who are only able to return the small number of 806 conformists for the whole of England. Green, in his "*History of the English People*," gives the following account of this Visitation :

Only the higher dignitaries were unsparingly dealt with. The bishops who, with a single exception, refused to take the oath, were imprisoned and deprived. The same measure was dealt out to most of the archdeacons and deans. But with the mass of the parish priests a very different course was taken. . . . The great bulk of the clergy seemed neither to have refused or to have consented to take the oath, but to have left the commissioners' summons unheeded, and to have stayed quietly at home. Of the 9400 beneficed clergy, *only a tenth* presented themselves before the commissioners. Of those who attended and refused the oath 189 were deprived, but many of the most prominent went unharmed.†

Thus considerably more than nine-tenths of the clergy refused to conform on this Visitation of 1559. This testimony is all the more striking because Green, in his earlier work, "*Short History*," trusting no doubt to Camden and others, repeats the usual Anglican story, but on consulting independent evidence felt bound to correct his mistake in his later work.

The Rev. N. Pocock, who is by far the best authority the High Church party possesses in the history of this period, wrote three letters in the *Guardian*—November 9, November 23, and November 30, 1892—which are worthy of being preserved. In one of them he deals with this point as follows :

What is commonly affirmed that all the clergy conformed to the new order, with the exception of about two hundred, cannot possibly be true. The number nearly represents the number of bishops, deans, archdeacons, canons of cathedrals, heads of houses, and fellows of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, who are known to have refused to adopt the new service of the Prayer-book, which, it must not be forgotten, was materially different from that which is in use now. And the great number of

* "Romes Tribute," &c., p. 11.

† Vol. ii. p. 305

ordinations which took place in the early years of Elizabeth's reign, and the number of priests and deacons ordained from time to time, prove that there must have been a large number of vacancies in the parsonages of the country. It is impossible that the number should have been so small as 192, as thirty-four years later, in the year 1602, the number of Roman priests, who were living peaceably and giving no trouble to the authorities, is spoken of as being considerable. The survivors of persons who were priests in 1558 could have been counted on the fingers in 1602, if there had been, as has been alleged, only 192 at the earlier date. Moreover, we know that in many dioceses a large proportion of the parishes were not served at all. Again, in the first year of Grindal's episcopate, many of the clergy had obtained licence to live beyond the seas, upon what was called misliking of religion, and their places were partially filled by thirty different ordinations which he held, at which he admitted 160 deacons and nearly as many priests to holy orders, a much larger number than can be accounted for by the deaths of incumbents or curates. Archbishop Parker, too, held five ordinations at Lambeth in less than three months after his consecration, at the last of which alone there were 155 priests and deacons ordained. The same conclusion comes out from the information given, January 24, 1561, by the Bishop of Ely—viz., that of the 132 churches in his diocese only thirty-two were properly served, there being thirty-four that had neither rectors nor vicars. It appears, also, that in the diocese of Norwich about half of the eight or nine hundred parishes had no rector or vicar, though the want was in some places supplied by a curate. And in the year 1565, so great was the destitution that the returns from about half the dioceses show that nearly a thousand parishes were wholly without spiritual superintendence. In the diocese of London there were about one hundred vacancies, whereas in two Welsh dioceses there were none. . . . About the same time, Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, says, of his 1200 churches, 430 were vacant. If this is not sufficient to prove that the clergy did not all conform, what is the meaning of Jewel's observation in his letter to Peter Martyr, August 1, 1559?

"Now that religion is everywhere changed, the Mass priests absent themselves altogether from public worship, as if it were the greatest impiety to have anything in common with the people of God ("Zurich Letters," i. p. 39).

Now this is a piece of scholarly work in pleasing contrast to the slipshod and careless assertions of modern Church defenders. The weary task of following and exposing this compiler of exploded historical fables is finished. The result of the critical inquiry proves that not one of his statements is from an historical point of view worth the paper on which it is written. The formidable list of Papal tributes to Anglican Orders, when looked into, falls to pieces like a house of cards.

V. SECTIONS IV. V., ETC., ANSWERED.—WITNESSES CROSS-
EXAMINED.

In these sections we have a crowd of witnesses produced to testify in favour of Anglican Orders, without any regard to the relevancy of their testimony. Some to testify to the fact that Parker was consecrated at Lambeth, a fact which is not now denied. Some to testify that if the succession can be proved, Anglican Orders ought to be recognised, and other points which are neither here nor there. Rome is only answerable for what she does herself. She certainly is not answerable for the private opinions of schismatics or heretics such as De Dominis, Du Pin, Courayer, Foulkes, and Döllinger; especially so in the case of a man like Courayer, whose opinions on Anglican Orders were condemned not only by the Archbishop of Paris and the Sorbonne, but by the Pope himself. To quote the opinions of such witnesses as forming part of Rome's tribute to the Anglican Orders is like quoting Arius as a Catholic witness against the divinity of Christ, or Satan as an angelic witness against the sovereignty of God. Such evidence must be ruled out of court by every fair-minded man. Nor is Rome answerable for the private opinions of individual Catholics, especially if they are not experts in theology, have no special knowledge of facts, and who multiply words without knowledge, which are tantamount to charging Rome with sacrilege every time she ordains a converted Anglican clergyman unconditionally, as is her invariable practice.

Nor is it much use quoting the words of foreigners, until it can be shown that they were in full possession of all the facts of the case. If their knowledge of the simplest facts of English history was derived from such works as "Rome's Tribute," which only copies from the works they were most like to have access to on the subject, it is no wonder if they believe in Anglican Orders. Some of the chief witnesses will now be cross-examined as to what they have to say on the question. It will not be necessary to do more than cross-examine some of the leading witnesses produced. In fact, it would be difficult to do more, for these opinions are as a rule borrowed wholesale from Harrington and Lee. No references to the original works

quoted from is given, and it is clear the author has not himself consulted original sources.

Bishop Bonner is called as a witness, who, we are informed on the authority of Lingard, with a slipshod reference to *Birmingham Magazine* (vol. v. 1834), said that the consecration of Parker had been performed "by bishops who had been restored after their deposition," of course by Pole, else the statement would mean nothing. This assertion is entirely false. Barlow, Coverdale, Scory and Hodgekin were not restored by Pole, as Bonner well knew. Scory was reduced by Bonner to the position of a priest. Hodgekin was suspended by Pole from episcopal functions, as may be seen in his dispensation; Barlow and Coverdale fled the country. It is needless to say that Lingard never said of Bonner what he knew as an historian was not historically true. A reference to Lingard's letter will show that Mr. Butler has done a very clumsy thing indeed. He has suppressed the very important word *not*. Lingard says that Bonner objected to the legality of Parker's consecration, because it had been performed by "bishops who had *not* been restored after their deposition," and who therefore were not provincial bishops as required by the laws of the Church and statutes and ordinances of the realm. The whole question in dispute between Bonner and Horne turned upon this very point. Bonner challenged the legal *status* of the whole Anglican hierarchy on the ground that those who acted as Parker's consecrators had been deposed and had not been restored; and as consequently they held no office in the Church of England, they had no more right to make an Archbishop of Canterbury than to make an archangel.* What can be said of a writer who manufactures evidence to impress the untutored mind in this fashion? If he is not a mere compiler, whose gross ignorance of the historical facts he undertakes to deal with affords some poor excuse for such egregious blundering, the only alternative is to charge him with attempting a deliberate fraud upon ignorant Anglicans, a charge which one is naturally unwilling to prefer

* The "Lambeth Register" is of itself conclusive evidence that none of these men had been restored to their Sees. Barlow is there described as "formerly bishop of Bath, now *elect* of Chichester;" Scory as "formerly bishop of Chichester, now *elect* of Hereford;" Coverdale as "formerly bishop of Exeter;" and Hodgkin as "suffragan of Bedford."

against a clergyman of the Church of England. But when a writer makes a misstatement to serve his purpose, with the evidence before his eyes that he is doing so, what other conclusion can be come to?

St. Alphonsus Liguori is produced as having spoken of "prelates occupying sees by virtue of orders conferred in Edward VI.'s reign as Catholic bishops," and in proof of this are quoted the following words : " *Pole confirmed in their sees the Catholic bishops, though installed in the time of schism.*" This extract merely states that well-known historical fact that Pole confirmed in their sees the Catholic bishops installed at the time of Henry VIII. before the Edwardine Ordinal was used. It is an equally well-known fact that Pole would not allow any prelate " by virtue of orders conferred in Edward VI.'s reign " to hold episcopal office in England. St. Alphonsus does not call such men Catholic bishops. This is a mere fiction on the part of the author of " *Rome's Tribute.*" Such men were known, not as Catholic bishops, but as " *Protestant superintendents.*"

The Bishop had exercised so much dominion and rigour, and been such Papalins, that the very name of bishop grew odious amongst the people, and the word " *superintendent* " began to be affected, and the rather, perhaps, being a word used in the Protestant churches of Germany, This the Papists made sport with.*

St. Liguori knew enough English history to know that such men were not, and were not called, Catholic bishops. They themselves repudiated the term Catholic as well as the term bishop.

Bishop John Milner, D.D., F.S.A., is quoted as another believer in Anglican Orders. In his great work, " *End of Controversy,*" Letter xxxii., under the heading, " *Uncertainty of the Orders of the Established Church from the Doctrines of its Founders, from the History of the Times, from the Defectiveness of the Form,*" he discusses the whole question, and referring to the change made in the Ordinal in 1662, he says :

But admitting that these alterations were sufficient to obviate *all* the objections of our divines to the Ordinal, *which they are not*, they came about one hundred years *too late* for their intended purpose ; so

* Strype, " *Memorials,*" ii. 141.

that if the priests and bishops of Edward's and Elizabeth's reigns were invalidly ordained and consecrated, so must those of Charles the Second's reign and their successors have been also.

Later on he adds: "Hence it clearly appears that there can be no *apostolic* succession of ministry in the Established Church, more than in the other congregations or societies of Protestants." A plain tribute to Anglican Orders.

Bishop Baines, D.D., O.S.B., is cited by Dr. Lee as a well-known believer in Anglican Orders. In the fourth Lecture on the "Outlines of Christianity," Bishop Baines thus speaks his mind :

There is not an apostolical Church in the world which will hold communion with the Church of England. The Greek schismatical Church spurns her; the Nestorian and Eutychian sects abhor her. In vain, then, does she boast her apostolical descent. Even if she prove it, which she cannot, the consecration of her first bishop being generally considered invalid, it would avail her nothing.

Rev. Nicholas Sanders, D.D., freely admits, we are told, that Anglican Orders were *confirmed* by Pole. We have seen what Pole really did with Anglican Orders. Sanders's editor records that Pole "confirmed all bishops which had been made in the former schism, provided they were *Catholic in their judgment of religion*." That is just the point. The Edwardine prelates were *not* "Catholic in their judgment of religion," and were not confirmed, but expelled from their sees for that reason. Sanders called such men "mock prelates."*

Very Rev. Christopher Davenport, D.D. (Fr. Francis of St. Clare), is produced as an undoubted believer in Anglican Orders. In his "Enchiridion of Faith" he thus delivers his final judgment :

Since they have changed the Church's forms *de industria* to declare that they do not what the Church intends and having solemnly decreed against the power of sacrificing and consecrating, as appears in the 28th and 31st Articles, it evidently concludes that they never did or could *validly* ordain priests, and consequently bishops.†

And much more to the same effect. Speaking of Dr. Goffe, he says he "was re-ordained as all others have been." This disposes of the assertion that some were allowed to act as priests without being ordained.

* "Anglican Schism," p. 291. Lewis's translation.

† See Estcourt's "Ordinations," p. 235.

Rev. Serenus Cressy, O.S.B., is said never to have been re-ordained, although Davenport's statement implies that he was. In the Clarendon Papers quoted by Lee (p. 251), occurs the passage, "Must I believe Hugh Cressy's resolve peremptory?" asks Lord Clarendon of Dr. Eccles. "Is it a necessary consequence to his conscience that if a man turn to that Church he must take orders in it? If we cannot keep him a minister in our Church, I wish he would continue a layman in theirs." Here we have it stated that Cressy's view was that an Anglican minister was only a layman in the Catholic Church, and that his resolve was peremptory to take orders in the Roman Church.

Very Rev. T. H. Canon Estcourt, another witness, has written an elaborate work to prove that Anglican Orders were not valid. He writes: "In view of all these circumstances, the inevitable conclusion follows, that Anglican ordinations must be considered as *altogether invalid*, and that there is neither bishop, priest, nor deacon in the Anglican Communion."*

Rev. John Lingard, D.D., another witness adduced by the Anglican writer, thus delivers himself upon the value of the Anglican form of ordination: "It bore no immediate connection with the episcopal character. It designated none of the peculiar duties incumbent on a bishop. It was as fit a form for the ordination of a parish clerk as for the spiritual ruler of a diocese."†

Readers by this time will be disposed to cry, Hold, enough! We have heard enough to show us how this trumped-up evidence breaks down under cross-examination.

The other cases of alleged recognition of Anglican Orders on the part of Roman Catholic writers of standing have been so completely disposed of by Canon Estcourt, Canon Raynal, Mr. Hutton, and Fr. Sydney Smith, in the *Month*, October 1893, that it must suffice to refer the reader to their works for further information. The introduction of a spurious speech of Bishop Strossmayer is specially without excuse. This distinguished bishop has over and over again denounced this clumsy forgery in the public press as a base and calumnious falsehood, and the author of "Rome's Tribute" ought to have known the fact.

* "Anglican Ordinations," p. 373.

† "History of England," vol. vi. note D.D., p. 330.

But supposing Anglican writers succeed in getting rid of the historical difficulties with which their position is surrounded, it may be asked *cui bono*?

There still remain the moral difficulties arising out of the visible facts which cannot be denied. "An increased sense among the Anglican clergy of their true position and responsibilities" * has led to spiritual action. This increased sense of their true position, as having valid Orders, is not "to the manner born." It is an excrescence and a new departure, which is resented by the old school as an undoing of the Reformation.† Priesthood, sacrifice, and a real presence are to them the rags and tatters of an exploded superstition, and on such principles has the Anglican system been worked for ages. If there were really valid Orders in this system, how came its professors to know nothing about such an important fact? Valid Orders imply valid baptism and a valid Eucharist. Could there be a valid Eucharist when we have no certain rule as to a valid baptism? And, if there is a valid Eucharist, how comes it that there has been no general recognition of the possession of such a gift, or any protective rite to save it from desecration?

If there is a true succession, there is a true Eucharist; if there is not a true Eucharist, there is no true succession. Now, what is the presumption here? If so great a gift be given, it must have a rite. . . . If it has a rite, it must have a *custos* of that rite. Who is the *custos* of the Anglican Eucharist? The Anglican clergy? Could I, without distressing an Anglican, describe what sort of *custodes* they have been and are to their Eucharist? *O bone custos*, in the words of the poet, *cui commendari, Filium meum!* Is it not charitable towards the bulk of the Anglican clergy to believe that so great a treasure has not been given to their keeping? And would our Lord have left Himself for centuries in such hands? Inasmuch, then, as the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Anglican Communion is without protective ritual and jealous guardianship, there seems to me a strong presumption that neither the real gift nor its appointed guardians are to be found in that Communion.‡

Is it not rather to be hoped that God withdrew the gift when the faith in it was lost, and so saved this country

* "Rome's Tribute," &c., p. 1.

† See Canon Farrar's article in the *Contemporary*, July 1893.

‡ Newman, *The Month*, Sept. 1868, p. 270.

the sacrilege, profanation, and impiety which would follow from this unbelief? Can any right-minded or pious man, when he reads how generations of ministers celebrated "the Supper," believe without a shudder that they were really consecrating the Body and Blood of Christ without knowing or intending what they were doing? Try to realise the scene of the "Supper" as described by a pious Anglican: "The Communion trestles were spread with a table-cloth, loaves and wine were supplied in abundance, and in some cases profusely; platters or trenchers were placed round the table, a sop of bread and wine made, was partaken of with spoons, &c."* Heylin also says: "The new Church is constrained to suffer cobblers, weavers, tinkers, tanners, card-makers, tapsters, fiddlers, gaolers, and others of like profession, not only to enter into disputing with her, but also to climb up into pulpits and to keep the place of priests and ministers;" and that "the residue of the sacrament (in loaf bread) was taken of the priest or of the parish clerk, to spread their young children's butter thereupon, or to serve their own tooth with it at their homely table."† Surely it is more respectful to the Establishment to hope that she has been spared the guilt of a series of horrible sacrileges enough to have caused another deluge.

* Lee's "Church under Elizabeth," vol. ii. p. 202. Parish accounts, Thame, Oxon. Documents from Simancas, Introd. pp. 17, 18.

† "Affairs of Church," &c., p. 174, &c.

ART. III.—TEMPERANCE AND THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

Neither must it be supposed that the solicitude of the Church is so occupied with the spiritual concerns of its children as to neglect their interests, temporal and earthly. Its desire is that the poor, for example, should rise above their poverty and wretchedness, and should better their condition in life, and for this it strives. . . . Christian morality, when it is adequately and completely practised, conduces to temporal prosperity; for it merits the blessing of that God who is the source of all blessings: . . . it makes men supply by economy for the want of means, teaching them to be content with frugal living, and keeping them out of the reach of those vices which eat up, not merely small incomes but large fortunes, and dissipate many a goodly inheritance.—LEO XIII., *Encyclical Letter on Condition of Labour*.

The use of strong drink produces more idleness, crime, disease, want, and misery than all other causes put together.—*Times*, Jan. 19, 1863.

England sober is England free, happy, and contented. If we could make the English working-man a total abstainer, we could settle the most serious of the social problems that confront us now.—CARDINAL MANNING.

THE Social Question is the question of the day. It was so, indeed, before Leo XIII. had written his Encyclical on the “Condition of Labour”: but that document has brought it into a prominence which it never could otherwise have attained. For the Governments of Europe, and for thoughtful men everywhere, it had been for long a subject for anxious study; the great crowd of the “disinherited of the world” had been sending up its cry of despair, till men were forced to hear, but it was only when the Father of the faithful spoke that all his children listened, and that the world’s attention became rivetted on the subject, as it is to-day. It was no new thing—though men thought it so—this concern of God’s Church for God’s poor. True, no Pope had previously written so formally on the subject of labour, but no Pope had ever ceased, and no Pope will ever cease, to take a fatherly interest in the welfare, temporal as well as spiritual, of the weak ones of his household. Its charity must ever remain a mark of the true Church; in this, as in other things, the Church of Christ must ever be like Christ Himself, and Christ

gave it as a sign to the messengers of St. John that "the poor had the Gospel preached unto them." Ever has it been the same ; from those early days of first Christian fervour, when men would have all things in common, to those latter times when we hear of a saintly priest dying for his leper flock, of a great cardinal making it the labour of his life and of his love to preach the redemption of slaves, and of our great reigning Pontiff crowning the noble work of a glorious life by pleading the cause of the poor, and vindicating the rights of labour. And what is the panacea which the Holy Father proposes ? Many had already been suggested ; men had been propounding various solutions, and there were theories beyond number that seemed very brilliant, but were as false as they were brilliant. The word of Leo differed from them all. It was new and yet old, new because it was so unlike the discordant jarring voices that had hitherto been distracting men's minds, and old because in recalling them to Christ and His teaching it only reminded them of truths which were old indeed, but had been forgotten.

The Encyclical does not treat explicitly of temperance ; the word does not once occur in it, but in the passages cited, and elsewhere, the subject is embraced and dealt with as fully as could have been expected in a document which, of necessity, treated of principles rather than details. What the Pope, however, could not have noted, had long since been remarked by students of the social question, and it cannot be without interest to study, in the light of recent developments, how much our drinking has to do with our poverty, and how deep down it is at the root of what has come to be called our Social Question. We are not of the number of those—if there are such people—who detect in teetotalism, or in any system of temperance reform, a panacea for the multitudinous and multiform ills of this world : there are social and economic conditions outside the temperance question, which must be calculated, and when every theory of the temperance and other reformer shall have had its fair trial, the words of Leo XIII. will yet be as true, and as necessary to be borne in mind, as ever.

To suffer and to endure therefore [says the Holy Father] is the lot of humanity ; let men try as they may, no strength and no artifice will ever succeed in banishing from human life the ills and troubles which

beset it. . . . And if society is to be cured now, in no other way can it be cured but by a return to the Christian life and to Christian institutions. When a society is perishing, the true advice to give to those who would restore it is to recall it to the principles from which it sprung.

Intemperance of language is sometimes said to be a characteristic of temperance advocates. We do not think strong language is either needful or helpful to so good a cause; and we will not knowingly use it. In the presence of appalling facts and figures, we shall sometimes, indeed, find it difficult to retain our equanimity; but we may then quote in extenuation the example of men in high places and holding high and responsible positions; for it was a Chief Justice of England that said: "I can keep no terms with a vice that fills our jails, that destroys the comfort of homes and the peace of families, and debases and brutalises the people of these islands;";* and it was an English Protestant bishop that said: "I use strong language because I see the mischief that this most detestable traffic is doing. I know that every effort I make, as a minister of religion, is more than neutralised by the efforts that are being made in an opposite direction."†

To observe some order, we may put our remarks under the headings—(a) Poverty, (b) Crime, and (c) Trade.

(a) Drink and Poverty.—The state of desperate poverty and degradation of large masses of people in our great cities is assuredly one of the chief factors of our social problem. A good deal of attention has been recently directed to the point. There are public officials whose duties send them to the slums, and there are others whose charity or philanthropy only direct them there: the former have given us reports and the latter graphic and harrowing descriptions, and every reader by this time must have heard of the squalid wretchedness and poverty to be found side by side with our wealth and luxury, and in the richest cities in this richest kingdom of the world. Let us look on this picture and on that; let us contrast for a moment the poverty of millions of our poor with the deplorable annual waste in these countries for intoxicating drinks. Mr. White, in a paper read before the Manchester Statistical Society, quotes as follows from a Report to the Liverpool Town Council,

* Chief Justice Coleridge.

† Bishop of Manchester.

and we must content ourselves with the one extract, taken from many similar :

Data connected with most of the houses in one of the apparently most destitute streets were submitted to us. . . . A man earns regularly 27s. and as regularly spends 21s. in drink. His four children are in rags. In another instance the wages are 30s.; the father and mother are drunken, and the three children are half starved and in rags. In another house is a copper-ore worker earning 27s. a week, almost all of which is spent in drink by himself and his wife. The children are in rags and filth, and look idiotic. In the same street are sober men earning 20s. or 23s. a week, and living in comfort.

After reading such statements, we begin to understand figures which to many appear incredible. It has been calculated that in London one out of three are relieved by some charitable institution, and that in England generally one in eight dies a pauper! Even writers from whom we have a right to expect the calm judgment and studied accuracy of the scientist are led to speak of

Multitudes working inhuman hours with unremitting toil for wages seldom sufficient and often a mockery; working, too, in horrible unsanitary conditions, dwelling huddled together in miserable overcrowded rooms; . . . and all this wretchedness after thirty years of peace, in the very world's centre of accumulated wealth and commercial power, in the very seat of world-wide dominion.*

Now let us look at the other picture, and see what we annually spend for intoxicating drink. The drink bill for 1891 was more than £141,000,000; it was an increase on the amount for the previous year of £1,725,205; and it meant for each individual of the population £3 15s., and for each family of five £18 15s. Commenting on these appalling figures, the Rev. Dr. Dawson Burns, from whom I take them, says:

The facts remain that a vast sum, equal to one-fifth of the annual National Debt, not far from twice as large as the annual national revenue, and compared with which all our boasted contributions to benevolence, science, and education are insignificant, was poured, last year, down the throats of a part of the people in the form of liquors, which made them neither wiser nor richer nor stronger, but, on the contrary, placed fresh burdens on the national shoulders, added fresh stains to the national conscience, and embittered with fresh miseries and troubles the national life.

* Devas, "Political Economy."

The better to realise the import of such figures, statisticians make various comparisons. We give about twice as much, for instance, for our intoxicating drink as for our bread ; our drink bill is larger than the rent-roll of the kingdom ; if we abstained for a few years we might wipe out our National Debt ; and the grain we destroy yearly for the purposes of distillation and malting would give about two hundred loaves to each family in these countries. Political economists, it is true, will largely discount our calculations. Mr. Devas, for instance, insists that one-fourth of what we call our drink bill must be set down, not as the price of drink at all, but as a tax on drink, which forms a large part of the public revenue ; and that, of the remaining figure, about a half may be taken as expended on the moderate use of drink, on what may be therefore considered as food, or served at least to "gladden the heart of man." But one or two obvious remarks suggest themselves. On his own showing, he admits that there remains a balance of some £50,000,000 a year that goes in wilful waste. Well, when we remember the state of millions of our fellow-men in the slums of all our large cities, of thousands of honest men looking for work and looking in vain, and of the children crying for bread from parents who cannot give it, I fear even this figure represents a waste that must be termed woful as well as wilful. About the "moderate use," the first thing we should determine is its meaning ; then only shall we be in a position of calculating its cost. If medical men have any *locus standi* at all in the temperance question, we would think they should have a voice here ; but we shall quickly find that what they mean by moderation is a very different thing indeed from what many or most of those who drink fancy it. Who, in fact, does *not* consider himself a moderate drinker ? As to the question of the revenue derived from the tax on drink, there arises the further question of the policy and the morality of fostering a trade which leads to so much misery for individuals, families, and the community at large. This was what Mr. Gladstone contemplated when he said, "I shall not think it compatible with my duty to oppose any such plan as the Permissive Bill on fiscal grounds. I should myself urge that fiscal grounds, whether they be important or not, must necessarily be secondary to that question. It ought to

be decided entirely on social and moral grounds." This is what Mr. Fernald,* an American writer, means when he says that it is better to raise our revenue by direct tax than a larger amount by drink tax; for while the saloon increases the taxes on the one hand, it depreciates, on the other, the value of property and the volume of honest business—a combination which no licence can meet. We should here consider and take into our calculation what is called the indirect cost of our drinking: the poverty and crime that follow; the sickness and premature deaths; the waste of time and loss to trade; the cost of maintaining our prisons, workhouses, and asylums, and so forth. It is generally held by temperance advocates that this indirect cost is at least equal to the direct; and Mr. White, who, as secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance, must have special means of acquiring correct information, does not hesitate to state that the cost, direct and indirect, is not less than £310,000,000 annually.

To tax a trade, and then apply a large portion of the revenue accruing to undo the mischief that had been produced, may seem deep wisdom to statesmen, but to others it looks almost grotesque. Large as has been the indirect cost of our drinking habits, there is but too much reason to dread that, present conditions remaining unchanged, it shall be still larger in the immediate future. We hear much nowadays of the claim for "old age pensions": when we shall be called upon to provide for our old folk, the cost must be set down, I think, to a large extent, to the same account to which we have already put a large proportion of the cost of our workhouses, prisons, and asylums. The aged poor cannot provide for themselves, and then the public must. A couple of years ago the Danish Government proposed an additional tax on beer, which was the ordinary drink of the masses. Thereupon the friends of the labourer introduced a Pensions Bill, on the principle that, if the poor were to be extra-taxed, they should be in some way proportionately benefited. The Pensions Bill became law; and about half the proceeds of the new beer tax was devoted to the purpose: a striking instance of what I have designated the grotesque action of governments—making people pay dearly

* "Economics o' Prohibition."

for their beer, and their consenting to provide for them, when they could purchase neither bread nor beer any longer. Instances of a similar kind might be multiplied, and some of them would be found in those countries. To teach the people how to provide for themselves would be, to the thinking of people who do not profess to be statesmen, more in accord with the duty and the interest of a paternal and a wise government. If we had been inculcating temperance and thrift at school: and if afterwards we had been striving to make it "easy to do right and difficult to do wrong," what a great living statesman has declared to be the duty of every government, instead of setting and multiplying drink-traps throughout the land, we should not now have to deal with the question of "old age pensions" and a score of kindred questions which go to make up our great social problem. How few, if any, are there among the poorest of our poor who could not "better his condition," and by the means which Leo XIII. suggests—"economy and frugal living"? One who speaks with authority on the dull science has ventured to state that the labouring man who had learned to lay aside the sum of £1 would never die a pauper. How few among our "submerged tenth" but could at one period of their lives or another have, with a little prudence and "frugal living," laid aside that sum? That the beginning is half the work, is nowhere so true as in economy; and no more useful lesson for the man to whom we would teach the first lessons in thrift. The beginnings of most of our poor people should of necessity be small indeed; but what a pity that they have not learned in their youth, what great things can be done, and what marvellous things have been done from beginnings as small as they could have been; that some of our merchant princes have started in life with a few shillings; and that from the lowliest ranks have come, in every age and country, men to fill the highest positions in every department of the State, and to win fame, in industry and invention, in literature, science, and art. When we come across some illustrations of what may be done with a little, how startling they seem! Three shillings spent weekly—Mr. Smilestellsus—will amount in twenty years to £240; in ten years more, with its interest, it will have bounded up to £420. A poor man that puts sixpence in a savings bank weekly for twenty years will have £40 to his credit, and £70 in thirty

years. Three pints a day—calculates Archdeacon Farrar—will cost £9 in a year, and with interest would equal in twenty years £257. An illustration of a somewhat different sort may be taken at random from one of the many useful but little known publications, of our Temperance Societies :

Supposing that £1,500,000 were turned over in a cotton factory in a year it is estimated that it would give employment to about seven thousand persons, whereas the same sum turned over in a distillery would only give employment to about one hundred and fifty persons. In 1880 the sum of £28,000,000 was spent in British spirits. To how many more people would it have given employment, if it had been expended in calico instead ? Answer, 127,866.*

But it may be said, that it is not after all the poor that spend their money in drink, and swell our annual drink-bill to its present appalling proportions: that it is in vain, therefore, to draw pictures of our poverty and of our waste; for the two things are far apart, and have no relation one to another; and that if great poverty and greater luxury co-exist, they do so in different places, and among classes of society that are totally distinct. If this were so it would matter little, and unhappily it is not so. First, what would it matter? May the denizens of our West End spend millions a year on their rare wines, while the hapless dwellers in our East End die in hunger? Is our social question solved, and may our wealth and poverty go on for ever, if only we keep them well apart, or if we manage to preserve a strip of neutral territory between them? Even this consolation, however, is not for us; for there are reasons but too conclusive to demonstrate that all participate, not alone in creating our drink-bill, but in its steady annual increase. A cursory study of the matter will reveal the fact that the increase is not limited to any one class of drink, and that it is shown alike in those which are the common drinks of the masses as well as those which may be considered the beverages of the opulent. It is a notorious fact that in the lowest slums in London and elsewhere gorgeous gin-palaces and public-houses thrive and multiply. It is sometimes a question whether we should say that drunkenness produces poverty, or rather the reverse; if we go for a solution

* "Temperance Arithmetic Questions."

into such places we shall probably be forced to the conclusion that it is a question of action and re-action. The public-house produces poverty, and as some one has said, "generates the slums"; but just as undeniably the slums produce drunkenness; for men are driven from their environments of squalor and degradation to seek a temporary solace in the various attractions of the neighbouring gin-palace. If we go into any of those localities, we can easily note the number of such establishments; we can as easily find the population in a given area, and from those premises we can at once see how much the poorest of our poor are spending day by day in intoxicating drink. It has been calculated, for instance, that in one of the lowest quarters of London 11,000 people—the poorest of the poor—spend annually no less than £16,000 for such drink. The inmates of our reformatories and homes for waifs come almost exclusively from the poorest class of society; it will be interesting therefore in this connection to inquire what it was that sent them to those establishments. Dr. Barnardo replies that 85 per cent. of his children owed their ruin directly or indirectly to the drunkenness or drinking habits of parents or relatives. Dr. Guthrie says that 99 per cent. of the children of his ragged schools come there for a similar cause, and we have reason to believe that the larger figure given by him is the more correct, for in his Report for 1888 Dr. Barnardo states:

I would not now hesitate to affirm that of all my young clients the percentage who are stricken down in life through the agency of the drink curse is nearer the very large figures given by the late Dr. Guthrie, than the estimate I formed in 1871. Dr. Guthrie stated repeatedly that no fewer than 99 per cent. of the children admitted to his ragged schools were the offspring of parents whose poverty was due to their drinking habits.*

In the year 1866 the Health Committee of Liverpool made a report on the social condition of the town. The following extract will be *apropos*:

The result of the inquiry is the conviction, supported by a mass of evidence, that the proximate causes of the increased death-rate are intemperance, indigence, and over-crowding, those two latter being generally

* "Cost of our Drinking Customs," by Mr. White.

found in the train of intemperance, although all three act and re-act on each other, as cause and effect. Your sub-committee need not here set forth in detail all the evils consequent on intemperance. *The evidence abundantly shows that the vice is alarmingly prevalent among the labouring population, and that its wretched victims and their families sink rapidly into squalid poverty resulting in over-crowding and its attendant evils.**

Testimonies of a similar kind might be multiplied. I shall add only one taken from a recent work that has attracted considerable attention, "The Irish in Australia," by Mr. Hogan.

The Irish emigrant to Australia [says the author], who systematically abstained from intemperance, and cultivated habits of industry, always attained to success and frequently arrived at affluence. Thousands of such instances might be quoted. On the other hand, it is equally true that some of our emigrant countrymen fall victims to the ever-open public-house, and the prevailing sociable conviviality of the colonies.

There is no need, however, to go abroad in search of examples and testimonies: instances meet our eye every day, and if they have ceased to excite surprise or even to attract attention, it argues only their frequency, and our familiarity with them. Every day, and in every village in the land, we are confronted with the sight of individuals and families who are prevented from "bettering their condition," as the Church so ardently desires, by intemperance; while, with hardly less frequency, we are forced to contemplate the still sadder sight of the ruin of families respectable, and once opulent, and the "dissipation of many a goodly inheritance" by the same cause. The extent of such dissipation even among the poor, and the loss direct and indirect, will sometimes seem almost incredible. I have known a tradesman who paid in fines alone, for drunkenness and the quarrels that followed, no less than £150. He frequently got drunk, and as frequently came in contact with the police; the fines became heavier as time went on, and offences were repeated; he was a good worker and regular in his payments, so that when necessary, the magistrates gave him time, and thus before the end of a rather long life the unfortunate man had paid the enormous sum stated. On one occasion, when he pleaded for time to pay a £5 fine, the magistrate said: "Indeed, poor man, you shall have time; for you have paid here as much as would purchase an estate, a

* *Ibid.* p. 9.

carriage, and a pair of horses." Duly, he came back with the £5, earned by honest and hard work, and when he paid it, he had not remaining, as I am assured, fivepence. A young fellow—to take another of the examples which one constantly meets—came to me while I happened to be engaged in writing this paper, to take the pledge. He was a drover: he could sometimes earn 10s. a day, and on an average 30s. a week; though he had been following his avocation for many years he seemed in a miserable plight, and it was but too plain he was not the owner of a penny. Taking his own statement as a basis of calculation, I have no hesitation in saying that had he been thrifty and temperate he might have had a better and happier life, and have now to his credit, in a savings bank, at least £100. One more illustration only. Just now our Militia regiments are being disbanded. The men composing them belong largely to the "residuum"—men who hardly ever possess 20s. together, except on the day of disbanding; humanly speaking a large proportion of them are destined to die in the work-house, and if within a month a relief fund were started in their respective parishes, many of them with their families would be found in the lists of applicants. The force numbers, I believe, some five or six thousand in the Kingdom; the men receive, in one shape or another, about £10,000. If each one of these men set aside his £1 bounty to make a beginning in life with, we should have there and then, about five thousand men, not one of whom, if our economy be not entirely deceiving us, was destined to die a pauper. But what are the facts? I do not like even to seem to exaggerate, but I do not know that I am not much within the truth when I say that I fear that half the amount will have passed over the bar of the public-house within a week, perhaps within forty-eight hours! Well, if so, it certainly is an argument for the better teaching of temperance and thrift in our primary schools, and it is at the same time a striking illustration of how closely connected our drinking is with our poverty.

We have spoken of cases in which men have raised themselves from the lowest ranks to wealth and distinction. It will be found, I think, a rule without exception that in such cases temperance had been the handmaid of industry, and that the men who so raised themselves had been, practically at least,

total abstainers. Nor is the reason far to seek, and the leaders of the labourers have come to see it. "The strongest link," says Mr. Powderly, "of oppression is that which I forge when I drown reason in strong drink. No man can rob me of the reason which God has given me unless I be a party to the theft." "The moral forces of the masses," says Cobden, "lie in Temperance. I have no faith in anything apart from that movement for the elevation of the working-class." The amount of possible savings for our labouring people is at best but small; so small that it must vanish where there is the habitual use of intoxicating drink. A man earns 12s. a week; of this sum 10s. goes, let us say, for his support and clothing; if he be a drinking man, even in a moderate way, the balance will disappear. A family of three or four has a weekly income of forty shillings; of this thirty-five goes to meet necessary household expenses; there is a balance of five shillings, but if the father or mother, or both, take a daily pint, the children that have commenced to earn are pretty sure to have commenced, like their parents, to drink, and the five shillings shall have vanished by Saturday night. Total abstinence would have a balance at the end of the year of £5 in the one case, and of £12 in the other; and what would be better than the balance, self-confidence and self-respect would soon be apparent, and the habit of economy which had saved so much would year by year become more systematic and more prized.

I had intended to deal with one or two other aspects of the social question, in their connection with temperance, but the subject of our poverty has suggested sufficient matter for one paper, and I think the reader will agree that this matter, if not pleasant, is at least practical, and worthy of our best consideration. At another time I may, with the editor's permission, add something on the kindred subjects of (b) Temperance and Crime, and (c) Temperance and Trade. That our drinking has to do with our poverty passes as a truism; but I cannot rid myself of the conviction that this is true to an extent which few if any of us realise, and which, if we did but realise it, would of itself all but adequately explain the poverty of which the world hears so much to-day. What we have written will help us to understand how true and full of

meaning are the words which a distinguished Irish prelate* recently spoke :

' The working-men had their own happiness and their own destiny in their own hands ; and if they were as faithful to the principles of temperance as some of those around him, whom he had known for fifteen years, there would be far less poverty, far less misery, and far less of the wretchedness which they so often saw in the homes of the working-man. *With Temperance would come prosperity.*

JAMES HALPIN, C.C.

* Dr. O'Dwyer, Bishop of Limerick.

ART. IV.—FATHER OHRWALDER'S CAPTIVITY.

Ten Years' Captivity in the Mahdi's Camp (1882–1892). From the Original Manuscripts of Father Joseph Ohrwalder, late Priest of the Austrian Mission Station at Delen, in Kordofan. By Major F. R. WINGATE, R.A. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1892.

THE vicissitudes of the Catholic Missions in the Soudan, of which the latest and most direful chapter is now before the public, have been followed in a series of articles in these pages.* Although created a Vicariate by Gregory XVI. in 1846, this vast district, transferred to the Franciscans by its first evangelisers, the Jesuits, in 1861, had lain almost fallow, until it found an apostle in the late Mgr. Comboni, created, in May 1872, Pro-Vicar Apostolic of the Missions of Central Africa, with spiritual jurisdiction over an area as large as that of the entire continent of Europe. He had, six years before, laid the foundation of a special organisation for mission work in Central Africa, in the Institute of Verona, founded in 1866 as a training college for male and female teachers, with an auxiliary establishment in Cairo, for the education of negroes and acclimatisation of missionaries. With the resources furnished by these institutions he was enabled at once to organise the missions of Kordofan, chosen by him as the chief field of his apostolic labours, in preference to the pestilential swamps of the White Nile, where climate had rendered the efforts of his predecessors almost nugatory.

Making El Obeid, the capital of this part of the Soudan, his base of operations, he sent out thence missionary colonies to the surrounding districts, of which the principal and most flourishing was that of Delen, established in 1875, among the Jebel Nuba, or Mountains of the Nubas, in Southern Kordofan. The missionaries were here well received by the population, though rather in a spirit of religious eclecticism than in that of converts, as they were willing at times to supplement their own

* April 1881, "Catholic Missions in Central Africa;" April 1884, "The Revolution in the Soudan;" April 1885, "The Destiny of Khartoum."

devotional observances by having recourse either to Christian or Mohammedan ministrations. Father Ohrwalder, who joined the little band of workers in this station on December 5, 1881, was most favourably impressed with its situation and surroundings. The monotonous aspect of the plain of Kordofan is here diversified by picturesque hill scenery, and vivified by the circulation of living streams. The intervening plains and valleys are covered with luxuriant vegetation, nourished by this perennial supply of water, and the *khors*, or ravines, are overgrown with trees of colossal dimensions, forming a canopy impenetrable to the rays of the sun. Vegetation is so rapid as to render the plains impassable during the rainy months, after which a clearance is effected by firing the waving sea of grasses and flowering plants that everywhere submerges them. Deer, antelope, and wild boar browse on this succulent growth, while the woods harbour elephants, apes, monkeys, and birds of varied plumage, as well as snakes, among which the boa constrictor is conspicuous.

About a hundred of the mountains forming this group are inhabited by a population which does not now exceed 50,000, though it was more considerable before the Nubas were decimated by the raids of the Baggaras and other Arab tribes, and the remnant obliged to take refuge in the most inaccessible retreats in the mountains. They lead peaceable and harmless lives, supplementing the wild fruits and vegetables which the bounty of Nature supplies in gratuitous abundance by the cultivation of a sufficiency of maize, sesame, and beans to furnish them with subsistence. They are monogamists, with the exception of the Khojur, their pontiff and chief, who governs them in accordance with their traditional laws and customs. Their religion consists of a number of superstitious rites and practices, erected into a system of imposture by the priests.

Among these mild-mannered savages a little agricultural colony was established by the missionaries, whose converts, removed from the temptations of the towns, worked steadily and well at the cultivation of the allotments of land assigned them. Jebel Delen, the particular group of mountains in which they had established themselves, consists of five hill summits, the highest point of which rises about 1500 feet above the plain, situated five days' march to the south of El Obeid. The heights

are formed of enormous granite blocks, piled one upon the other, with intervening cavities in which panthers and other wild beasts have their dens. Only two of the hills are inhabited by a population remarkable for their tall stature and graceful carriage.

On this happy pastoral community the storm-cloud of havoc that was about to overwhelm the entire Soudan broke on April 8, 1882, in the shape of a local raid of the Baggara Arabs of the plains. These tribesmen, who are even in peace little better than banditti, had joined the standard of the Mahdi, while the mountaineers of Delen had remained faithful to the missionaries and loyal to the Government of Egypt. Taking refuge in the inaccessible fastnesses of the mountains, they were able to maintain a desultory border warfare for four months, until the advance into Kordofan of the main body of the dervishes, flushed with victory after the massacre of an Egyptian force under Yussuf Pasha Esh-Shellali, on June 7th of that year. The whole *personnel* of the mission fell into the hands of a detachment of the rebel army, under an ex-slave-dealer, Mek Omar, on September 15, and their story is thenceforward intertwined with that of the extraordinary man whose name must be inscribed among those of the greatest scourges of humanity. The early life of Mohammed Ahmed, and the rise of his baleful star on the horizon of history, are already matter of public knowledge, but we know no darker chapter in the story of the human race than that of his and his successor's rule, as now fully told for the first time in the pages before us.

He was at this time about forty years of age, and not enervated as yet by the subsequent life of self-indulgence which cut short his career in its zenith of triumphant achievement. In the eyes of his superstitious followers he was invested with a halo of miraculous prestige, from the ability or good fortune which had enabled him to destroy in succession every Egyptian force sent against him. He had just before this period appointed three Khalifas—Abdullah, already named as his successor, Ali Wad Helu, a powerful Arab chieftain, and his own son-in-law, Ali Esh-Sherif, like himself a native of Dongola. The two first-named leaders represented the Baggaras, or Arab tribesmen, whose party eventually gained the ascendancy over the

rival interest of the Gellabas, or traders, called Walad el Beled (people of the country) or Walad el Bahr (people of the river), led by the Mahdi and Sherif. Each Khalifa commanded a section of the army classified under these different nationalities, and led by a number of emirs, all carrying distinctive flags. These officers, whose rank may be considered to correspond to that of colonel, although the number of men commanded by them varied from fifty to four thousand, had under them Mukuddums, or subordinate officers, and these again others of still inferior grade. The fighting instincts of the fierce warriors were unshackled by any system of drill, and they were armed in the beginning, in imitation of the forces of the original Prophet, with sticks and lances alone. Their wild onset, spurred by the reckless heroism of fanaticism, formed, as the English learned later to their cost, a very efficient substitute for all conventional tactics or discipline.

It was to the headquarters of this motley host, 100,000 strong, by that time encamped before El Obeid, that the little missionary party, consisting of Father Bonomi, the Superior, Father Ohrwalder, two lay-brothers, and four sisters, were conducted by their captors after a weary and exhausting march. Their appearance in the camp was the signal for an outbreak of such wild excitement that their escort had to form square and protect them with their swords against the violence of the yelling crowd of dervishes. The Mahdi himself, a master of dissimulation, treated them with courtesy, inflicting on them nothing worse than a long harangue on his victories and his mission ; but by the Khalifa Abdullah, to whose hut they were next conducted, they were plainly told that they had only to choose between death and apostasy. A few days later it was announced to them that they were to be beheaded on the following morning, and they spent the night in preparation for death. The dawn was signalised by a wonderful apparition, a brilliant comet, whose tail rose like a silver scimitar brandished above the eastern horizon. Termed by the dervishes Nijmet el Mahdi, the Mahdi's star, it recalled to the captives the Star of Bethlehem, and to Mussulman and Christian seemed to herald a different form of triumph. So near did it come in the case of the latter, that in the centre of the mighty host of their enemies, marshalled in full parade, they were

ordered to bend their necks to receive the deathblow. But theirs was not to be so speedy a martyrdom, and the stroke did not fall. Summoned before the arbiter of their destiny, they found him mounted on a magnificent white camel, sheltered by an umbrella held over his head by a slave riding behind him. Again the Prophet of Islam treated them with mild forbearance, inspired probably by involuntary admiration of their constancy, and rode on after addressing to them the single ejaculation, "May Allah lead you to the way of truth."

Their ultimate fate, however, still hung in the balance, and was discussed at a council held a little later. Although the majority were in favour of their death, the opinion of an Emir, who maintained that it was unlawful to slay priests who had offered no resistance, prevailed, and they were handed over to the kindly care of George Stambuli, an influential Greek, who had befriended them to the utmost of his power.

Sheltered in a hut of straw and branches, they now formed part of the vast camp filling up the whole plain round El Obeid, and making it seem at night, when innumerable fires were lit, like a sea of tossing flame. The aggregation of this mass of humanity soon produced fever and other illnesses among the little band of missionaries, and ere a month three of their number, two sisters and the carpenter Mariani, had fallen victims to these disorders. Meantime, El Obeid, closely invested on all sides, was undergoing the horrors of famine, and the once pleasant city, with houses interspersed with palm-groves, was little better than a charnel-house, where the dead lay unburied in the streets, and carrion kites, gorged until too distended with their hideous repast to be able to fly away, were rendered in their turn a prey to starving humanity. The sufferings of the inhabitants were shared by the missionaries within the walls, and Father Losi, the Superior, died of their results in the form of scurvy, in the month of December. The survivors, Father Rossignoli, with brother Locatelli and four sisters, of course fell into the hands of the Mahdi when the town was compelled to capitulate a little later, on January 19, 1883, and after he had vainly sought to force them to apostatise they were allowed to join their companions in the camp. In defiance of the terms of surrender of the Egyptian forces, the principal officers were

slaughtered and the inhabitants enslaved, while the town was given up to pillage. It was then occupied by a portion of the victorious army, while the remainder lived in huts forming a ring of suburbs outside the walls. Great luxury and indulgence were now substituted for the former abstemious life of the camp, and the Mahdi and his officers, quartered in the principal Government buildings, gave themselves up to indolence and pleasure. The finances were reorganised on the basis of general confiscation, and an austere code of laws promulgated, penalising even such minor offences as smoking and drinking.

During this pause in the precipitate course of the Soudan revolution, the prisoners continued to drag out a miserable existence, varied only by vague, and often false, rumours of events happening at a distance. Hope revived, however, as the summer went on, for a great army was known to be advancing to their relief, and news of its approach was daily looked for. The fate of that army is matter of history, but the details of the disaster, and the inner record of the means by which it was brought about, have never been clearly given to the world before. It was on November 1 that Mohammed Ahmed marched out from El Obeid, followed by every man, woman, and child within its walls, to give the doomed force of Hicks Pasha to feed the hyenas and the kites. Led by treacherous guides, they had simply marched into a death-trap, and the dervishes, who hemmed them in with a ring of fire on every side, had little to do but

To slay, and slay, and slay.

It was not so much a battle as a massacre, for while on one side but five score men survived as prisoners out of eleven thousand, the loss on the other was no more than three hundred and fifty. Money and war material, Krupp and machine guns, Remington rifles, axes and other implements, watches and clothing, were all appropriated by the *beit el mal*, or public treasury of the Mahdi, who amid an indescribable scene of savage exultation re-entered El Obeid in triumph on November 6. The result was decisive of the fate of the entire of Kordofan and Darfur, the whole of which latter province submitted to the conqueror in the space of eight days.

The sufferings of the missionaries were much aggravated

about this time by the misfortune which befell their friend and protector, Stambuli. A charge having been brought against him through envy, he fell into disgrace, and though eventually acquitted and restored to favour, was permanently deprived of his property, and so rendered unable to maintain his *protégés* as he had hitherto done. They were consequently now reduced to support themselves as best they could by the aid of industries with which they had previously eked out their subsistence.

The sisters [says the narrative] made jibbehs (dervish coats) which Stambuli sold and gave us the proceeds. We obtained the material chiefly from the clothes of the soldiers who had been killed, and from the officers' tunics. O'Donovan's mackintosh and some other articles of clothing which Klootz (one of the survivors) recognised, came into our hands, and were soon cut up. Most of the clothing was stained with blood, which we were obliged to wash out; but what bitter thoughts occupied our minds in this sad task!

Events were now hurrying on to the crowning tragedy of the Soudan, for intelligence was secretly conveyed to the Fathers that an English Envoy had reached Khartoum, and the tide of battle was about to roll onwards to that doomed city. Hope, however, revived for a time in the breasts of the captives, when a letter from Gordon reached the Mahdi, asking for their release, and promising to recognise him as Sultan of all the Western Soudan. These proposals the Mussulman ruler laughed to scorn, well aware that the gallant Englishman was unsupported by material force. He remarked that he was offered nothing but what he possessed already, while the very ground his adversary stood on was his as soon as he came to take it. His reply was a request to him to come and join him, the letter being accompanied by the gift of a full dervish uniform—jibbeh, turban, and sandals.

This embassage despatched, the wild hordes of Islam were set in motion once more, and heralds were sent out, east, north, south, and west, calling on all to follow on the Mahdi's track to Rahad, the great gathering-place on the way to Khartoum. In the midst of this fresh upheaval of the forces of fanaticism, the Christian prisoners' lot became a doubly hard one, as all were distributed as slaves among the different emirs as a preliminary to the march. The poor sisters in particular

suffered a cruel persecution in order to compel them to abandon their faith, the Khalifa's wives adding their insults and vituperations to those of their male captors. The priests, too, were treated with the greatest indignity, and with a refinement of insolence the Mahdi's three sons, ranging from seven to ten years of age, were daily sent to insult and torment Father Ohrwalder.

At length [he goes on] on April 7, 1884, the Mahdi set out, and we with him. The huge camp, swarming with thousands and thousands of people, became empty in a few days, and each one as he left his hut set fire to it, so that nothing was to be seen but clouds of smoke and flames darting upwards to the sky.

Just as we were leaving, I was made over to another master, Idris Wad el Hashmi. When I arrived at his house I found everything ready for the journey ; numbers of well-bound books were lying about on the floor. I picked one up and found it was "The Soldier's Pocket-book," by Lord Wolseley. I would like to have searched among these books for a diary, but they turned me out ; Idris had taken them out of some good leather trunks which he had filled with his own effects. Three days after the Mahdi's departure, my master and I quitted El Obeid. The road to Rahad was one uninterrupted stream of human beings—men, women, and children ; camels carrying the household goods, on the top of which were fastened angaribs, on which women were seated ; oxen and donkeys, all heavily laden ; numbers of Arabs were driving along their flocks with them ; here one sees a camel fallen under its heavy load, there a child or a slave vainly seeking in the crowd for its lost master. Of course I had to walk, and to act as a camel-driver as well, subject to continual insult and threatening. I moved along as best I could ; the Arabs applauded my master's good sense in making me his camel-driver, and urged that I should carry a load as well. We had to halt frequently, as the camels were so heavily laden.

The burning sun and fatigue were terribly oppressive, and it always is a wonder to me how I escaped sunstroke. As to food, I had a share of my master's horses' meal. In the evening I was obliged to clean the dokhn (grain) which was given to the horse, and the pangs of hunger made me covet even this, while I was obliged to ask my master's slave to occasionally give me a gulp of water ; indeed, this slave pitied my wretched state.

Still greater sufferings were undergone by the sisters, obliged to walk the whole distance barefooted over thorns and burning sand, and sometimes to carry heavy loads as well. Little food or drink was allowed them during the three days' march, and when they stopped to rest for a moment they were driven forward under the lash of their masters'

whips. Nor did their persecution cease until after their arrival at Rahad, when one of them succeeded in forcing her way into the presence of the Mahdi, who so far relented as to allow them to be placed under the protection of the Greeks attached to the army in various capacities. Their worst sufferings were then at an end, and they lived thenceforward in comparative peace and tranquillity.

The camp at Rahad was, as may be imagined, an unsavoury residence, and the festering matter allowed to collect undisturbed under the torrid sun, bred such a plague of flies that eating by day was impossible, since "one would have eaten as many flies as food." The scene, however, was not without a certain impressiveness when "at prayer time thousands upon thousands of dervishes ranged themselves in well-ordered lines behind the Mahdi, and the shout of 'Allah Hou Akbar' resounded through the air."

Here, on two occasions, the Father was summoned to an interview with his captor, and the pair, seated on the ground under a large tree, carried on a religious disquisition at intervals from morning to night. The recitation of the Lord's Prayer in Arabic by Father Ohrwalder, as a specimen of Christian orisons, very much surprised the listeners, who had been taught to believe that the Giaours did not know how to pray. The Prophet acknowledged, too, that Christians were good people who fed the hungry, but declared all such deeds of mercy useless, as those who did not believe in him "were but wood for the fire."

At this juncture, the English Cabinet still held the fate of Khartoum and of the Eastern Soudan in the hollow of its hand, for the Mahdi had halted in his march, intimidated by the bare rumour of an expedition, and lay crouching in his camp at Rahad, like a wild beast in his lair, waiting to see if his enemy would indeed be given into his hand by his abandonment by his countrymen. Father Ohrwalder's view of Gordon's mission is that without such support it was worse than useless, delaying till too late the withdrawal of garrisons and population, by deluding them with the false hopes of European succour. The glamour of a single name was unavailing against all the wild hates and passions unchained in the uprising of the desert.

Throughout the summer, while England was wavering between rescue and betrayal, the war cloud was steadily gathering around Khartoum, and the fall of Berber, after eight days' siege by some of the neighbouring tribesmen, completed its isolation on the north. It was not, however, until August 8 that the main camp of the Mahdists broke up, and that its massed multitude, over 200,000 in number, with 4000 horsemen, began to roll heavily forward on its long march through an untracked region, over ground sodden by the rain. Fresh cavalry continued to join all along the way, and herds of cattle, driven with the troops, died in such numbers on the road as to mark it with an unbroken line of carcasses. Meat was plenty but grain scarce, as all agricultural pursuits were abandoned by the population. The headquarters reached Omdurman on October 23, 1884, but stragglers continued to come in until the beginning of November. The advantage temporarily conferred on the besieged by the rise of the Nile had by that time been nullified by the fall of the rivers, as the defensive efficacy of the great natural ditch made by their confluence was correspondingly diminished. Hemmed in on all sides by the Mahdi's motley array, the town was soon reduced to sore straits by want of provisions, and treachery aided the demoralising effects of famine within its walls. Father Ohrwalder does full justice to Gordon's extraordinary resourcefulness, energy, and influence over the inhabitants :

He was almost superhuman [he says] in his efforts to keep up hope. Every day, and many and many a time during the day, did he look towards the north from the roof of the palace for the relief which never arrived. He overcame the want of money by issuing paper bonds ; but soon the people refused to accept them, and to enforce his order he sent fourteen merchants to the east bank, just in front of the enemy's guns ; this he did to frighten them, and when they agreed to accept the bonds, he had them brought back to the town. To further strengthen the belief of the people in the arrival of the English, he hired all the best houses along the river-bank and had them prepared for their occupation. He was sure they would come—but when? The time was pressing. How eagerly he searched the distant horizon for the English flag he longed to see, but every day he was doomed to disappointment. He won the people's hearts by his generosity, and even to this day all who knew him never cease speaking of his kindness. His endeavours to recompense the Greeks for their honesty are affecting in the extreme. He elaborated numerous plans for their escape.

These, however, were frustrated by disagreements and difficulties among those he hoped to save, and they remained to share his fate.

The final catastrophe was, according to the narrative, only precipitated by the effort to avert it, for the approach of the Nile Expedition, forced by public opinion on the hesitating counsels of the English Government, drove the besiegers on to the assault.

How the end came by the stealthy entry of the besiegers just before daybreak on the morning of Monday, January 26, through an unrepaired breach in the parapet, has often been told, though perhaps never so authoritatively as here. The wild yells which announced the presence of the assailants, awoke the sleeping city to a scene of horror such as has rarely been surpassed or equalled. Many heartrending details are given in the Father's narrative, but suffice it to say that the blood fury of the fanatics was only satiated by the massacre of 10,000 human beings, whose headless corpses filled the streets, where they were left unburied until the plunder had been distributed. The survivors might perhaps have envied their fate, for a cruel enslavement was their lot, and many women became utterly blind from continuous weeping over the losses they had sustained.

Gordon was spared the sight of these miseries, for he fell at the first spear-thrust on the staircase of the palace to which the earliest rush was made. The missionaries had fortunately been withdrawn before the siege, in December 1883, by Mgr. Francesco Sogaro, the successor of Mgr. Comboni, who died in October 1881.

The captured city was divided between hundreds of emirs and mukuddums, each of whom planted his flag in the quarter captured by his men. Then came the work of sharing the wretched prisoners, principally women, amid harrowing scenes of woe. The Mahdi had the first choice, followed by the three Khalifas, after whom come the emirs and other officers in order of their rank. All booty not furtively secreted was carried to the public treasury, where the glut of money was so great as to reduce the value of the sovereign to two and a half dollars. It was while these tragedies were being enacted that the vanguard of the English Expedition by a terrible irony of

fortune, the bitterest demonstration of what might have been, reached Khartoum just forty-eight hours too late. The prodigies of valour, energy, and endurance performed by men and officers in the advance, could not compensate for the initial error of the tardiness of their despatch, and the irrevocable stroke of doom once more knelled its mocking sentence on human hopes and calculations. Father Ohrwalder's remarks on this subject are painful, but perhaps wholesome reading for the English public, so difficult to rouse to a sense of responsibility for the conduct of events at a distance :

Had the Khartoum people but seen one Englishman with their own eyes they would have taken fresh courage, and would in all probability have held out another month, until the relief for which they had waited so long was a *fait accompli*. The Mahdi would not have dared to assault Khartoum ; and even if he had, it is most probable he would have been beaten back. Many survivors of Khartoum often said to me, "Had we seen one Englishman we should have been saved, but our doubt that the English were really coming, and the feeling that Gordon must be deceiving us, made us discouraged, and we felt that death would be preferable to the life of constant war and daily suffering we were leading during the siege."

The unaccountable delay of the English was the cause of the fall of Khartoum, the death of Gordon, and the fate of the Soudan. The Mahdi only made up his mind to attack when he heard that they had delayed at Gubat. He did not begin to cross over his troops until the 24th of January, and it was not till Sunday night that the crossing was complete. He could not have attacked earlier than he did. When the first news of his defeat at Abu Klea reached him, he wished to raise the siege and retire to Kordofan. If the English had appeared at any time before he delivered the attack, he would have raised the siege and retired. Indeed, it was always his intention to revisit El Obeid before he made his attack.

Even to the present day people in the Soudan cannot understand the reason for the delay. Some say that the English general was wounded at Abu Klea, and was lying insensible, and that those who were acting for him did not dare to undertake any operations until he was sufficiently recovered to be able to give his orders.

Such were the speculations of the sufferers by this lamentable failure, those prisoners who, we read, after their release, were allowed to live by begging, and who, accustomed as they were to lives of comparative luxury, mostly died off of disease induced by the hardships and privations they were thus condemned to.

Nor did the victors escape retribution for their cruelty. The neglect of agriculture for war produced famine, and in its train came pestilence, so that the unhappy country was ravaged by the dreadful triple scourges of the divine wrath. Fever and other diseases were followed by a terrible epidemic of small-pox, the contagion of which was diffused through the most distant provinces by those seeking to escape from it.

The Mahdi himself did not long survive his culminating triumph, and it even indirectly led to his end. The life of indolence and excess to which he gave way when all necessity for self-restraint was thereby removed, brought on fatty degeneration of the heart, of which he died on June 22, 1885, within six months of the fall of Khartoum.

Thus ended [says Father Ohrwalder] a man who left behind him a hundred thousand murdered men, women, and children, hundreds of devastated towns and villages, poverty and famine. Upon his devoted head lies the curse of his people whom he had forced into a wild and fanatical war, which brought indescribable ruin upon the country, and exposed his countrymen to the rule of a cruel tyrant from whom it was impossible to free themselves.

He left to his successor, the Khalifa Abdulla, an empire stretching from the Bahr el Ghazal to the Second Cataract, and from Darfur to the Red Sea, still further consolidated almost immediately after his death by the fall of Sennar and Kassala, which had held out till then.

Fathers Bonomi and Ohrwalder had, previous to these events, been carried back to El Obeid, and experienced great kindness while there from Lupton Bey, ex-Governor of the Bahr el Ghazal, himself a prisoner. Thence the former succeeded in making good his escape, with the assistance of an Arab employed for the purpose by a compatriot in Egypt. The grief and despair of Father Ohrwalder at being left behind in captivity may be imagined, but as he was not known to be in El Obeid at the time, arrangements had been made for the rescue of only one.

When he returned to Khartoum, in April 1886, the ex-capital of the Soudan was a heap of ruins, already covered with a scrub of acacia and thorn. Its destruction had been decreed by the Khalifa through jealousy of the Ashraf, or nobles settled there, out of reach of his immediate supervision.

The command was given that all should evacuate the town within three days, and on the fourth the work of its destruction began. The houses were pulled down, and some of their materials transported to Omdurman, so that with the exception of the arsenal, mission-house, and Gordon's palace, there was not left of it a stone upon a stone.

Omdurman, where a beehive town of straw huts had sprung up, girdling the headquarters of the Mahdi, continued to wax as its rival waned, and enjoyed a certain amount of squalid prosperity. It had a market, where goods displayed by day were removed for safety to their owners' houses at night, and Greeks, Jews, and Syrians made a living by ministering to the primary necessities of their less sophisticated neighbours. The treasury was full of corn and slaves, and the only tax levied was the zekka, or alms for the poor, amounting to 2½ per cent. The Mahdi had instituted a mint where gold and silver coinage was struck in his name, the specie being furnished by the plunder of Khartoum. There was also a more primitive currency of pieces of cloth of various recognised values, but these became so ragged and greasy in course of circulation that they had to be withdrawn, as even the authority of the Khalifa could not continue to compel their acceptance. A profit of 50 per cent. was made by the coinage of silver, in what were known as "Makbul" dollars, since that word, signifying "accepted," was stamped upon them. Foreign coins of various denominations, such as the Medjidie and Maria Theresa dollar, were also current, and among them the English sovereign, known as "khayala," (cavalry) from the St. George on the obverse. In the face of so much foreign competition, the Government coinage was maintained at par only by violent interference with the natural laws of exchange. The merchants having made difficulties about accepting it, Abdullah had all the goods in the market seized by his officers, and sequestered for fourteen days, after addressing the following curious remonstrance to their owners: "That unbeliever, Gordon, induced merchants to accept miserable bits of paper as equivalents for money, and I now offer you silver, and you won't even take it." This *coup d'état* naturally had the desired effect of rehabilitating the depreciated currency, and the "Makbul" dollar thenceforward

justified its name by continuing to pass unquestioned as legal tender.

The fatal fortune of war, which had given an empire to the Mahdi, continued to smile on his successor, and the hideous tale of conquest and massacre under Abdullab, never adequately told before, runs almost uninterruptedly through Father Ohrwalder's pages. The course of the war in Abyssinia, resulting in the defeat and death of King John, rendered him temporarily master of a rich and prosperous country through which he carried fire and sword, followed by pestilence and famine. Various movements of revolt against his authority among the Arab tribes in the Soudan were punished by their extermination, and the unsuccessful rebels were strung up by dozens on improvised gallows in Khartoum.

By a stroke of the Khalifa's pen all the towns and villages on the Blue Nile, as far south as Karkoj, were depopulated, the decree which compelled their unfortunate inhabitants to migrate to Omdurman raising the population of that pseudo-capital to 150,000 souls. This was in 1888, and in the following year a terrible famine devastated the land, as the result of these and other arbitrary measures. Scenes of indescribable horror were enacted in Omdurman itself, while in the provinces whole districts were depopulated and tribes of 40,000 and 87,000 dwindled to 4,000 and 10,000 respectively. These sufferings had no effect in softening the heart of the monster Abdullah, who restricted his benefactions to the Baggara Arabs, cherished by him as the pillars of his empire.

During these various disasters the Europeans who had fallen into the hands of the Mahdi and Khalifa, underwent many vicissitudes of fortune. Lupton Bey and a German named Neufeld were for a time employed in the manufacture of cartridges, after enduring the terrible experience of imprisonment in Khartoum. The missionary captives were leading a life of great hardship and penury, cheered from time to time by hopes of rescue or escape. Father Ohrwalder, who had been released from slavery in 1886, lived at first with a Greek who gave him generous hospitality, but after eight months built a hut for himself, and shared the fortunes of a lay-

brother who kept a small shop in the market-place. He then went into partnership with Lupton Bey in a soap factory, but the sudden death of the latter in May 1888 brought this speculation to an end. The Father's inventiveness then suggested to him the idea of making hooks out of telegraph wire which the sisters sewed on to purses and headresses, but the business ceased to be a lucrative one when the novelty wore off, and the caprice of Soudanese fashion turned in some other direction. It then occurred to him in his desperation to try and learn how to make the ribbons with which the women in Omdurman ornamented their trailing garments, but the pursuit of this branch of knowledge was beset with formidable difficulties, as the men in the trade required a fee of forty or fifty dollars, in this case prohibitive, for teaching it. The missionary, however, was not to be baffled, and by unravelling the ribbon and closely studying its make, he actually succeeded in teaching himself how to weave it. He found the work very trying, and in the beginning could only by a hard day's toil turn out four yards, value four piastres, out of which he had to purchase the thread. With continuous practice, he managed at the end of the month to manufacture sixteen yards a day, which brought in sufficient money for the necessities of life—that is to say, dhurra bread and boiled vegetables, without oil, butter, or meat. The mission sisters were at this time able to earn a precarious living by needlework, an industry in which, however, there was severe competition, from the number of women reduced to support themselves in the same way by the disasters of the country.

During all these years the good Archbishop, Mgr. Sogaro, had never lost sight of the fate of his hapless children, and continued to make unremitting efforts for their deliverance. He interceded on their behalf with all Governments, Moslem and Christian, and kept one of his missionaries constantly stationed on the Egyptian frontier, where they relieved each other by turns, in order to seize any possible opportunity of communicating with them. Many attempts failed through the bad faith of the native emissaries, which is the less to be wondered at as the transport of letters endangered the lives of both bearers and recipients, while the escape of a lay-brother by the Nile route to Berber, caused the

Khalifa to exercise a closer surveillance over the remaining Europeans.

In the autumn of 1891 their prospects were gloomy in the extreme, and hardship and penury had reduced them all to the last extremity of weakness and disease. The work at the loom had begun to tell on Father Ohrwalder's health, so as to bring on haemorrhage from the lungs with great emaciation, and the nerves of all were so shattered by the sufferings they had undergone that they trembled at the slightest noise, and started at every knock at the door. On October 4, 1891, the little band were still further depressed by the death of one of their number. Sister Concetta Corsi, who had long been in a low state of health, was carried off by typhus fever, and as her companions laid her remains with a short prayer in the warm sand of the desert outside the town, they envied her release from a life of hopeless misery.

But the hour of their deliverance was at hand, when hope, long deferred, had died within them, and on October 28 its instrument appeared when least expected. Some months previously a young Ababdeh Arab, named Ahmed Hassan, had sought an interview with Father Ohrwalder and volunteered to carry a letter for him to Mgr. Sogaro, and after some hesitation he had entrusted him with one, though with little hope of its reaching its destination. This man now reappeared, and told him that all arrangements had been made for their escape. There is no more thrilling story in the annals of adventure, real or fictitious, than that of the flight that followed, as recounted in Father Ohrwalder's simple and graphic narrative.

The number of fugitives to be arranged for was now reduced to four, Father Ohrwalder himself, two Italian sisters, Caterina Chincarini and Elisabetta Venturini, and a little black slave girl, named Adila, born in the mission-house at Khartoum and given back to the missionaries after having been sold into slavery. It was absolutely necessary to take her with the party, as their evasion would otherwise have been discovered. The Arab had been given £100 with which to purchase camels, and had also engaged two other Arabs as guides, one from Berber, and one from Korosko. The time seemed favourable for the attempt to escape, as a combination against the tyranny of Abdullah had been formed by the two other Khalifas, Sherif

and Ali Wad Helu, which threw the town into a state of ferment and excitement. Under cover of these disturbances, Ahmed succeeded in buying four good camels at from 120 to 150 dollars apiece, which he then distributed among his friends to keep and feed for him, as it was necessary to conceal the fact that they were in his possession. The days intervening before all was ready for the start were a time of terrible suspense for the captives, and the fever of excitement they were in rendered it impossible to eat or sleep. During this interval an important piece of news came to the ears of Ahmed—viz., that in consequence of the critical state of politics, all the riding camels of the Government had been despatched with messengers to the provinces, rendering immediate pursuit impossible if the party once got clear away.

At last, on a Sunday night, the supreme moment arrived, and Ahmed came to summon the party to mount without delay and ride for their lives. Carrying some few belongings, they stumbled through the darkness to the rendezvous, were helped hurriedly on their camels, and started off on their ride of 500 miles across the deserts.

Not thirty yards from where we were [says the narrative] was a well around which a number of female slaves were gathered, but the little noise we made was drowned by their laughter. The moment of mounting was perhaps the most dangerous time, for the camels were restive and longing to be off. It was with the greatest difficulty the Arabs could keep their mouths closed, and no sooner were we on their backs than we glided swiftly away into the darkness. Now and then we saw fires, at which the people were cooking their food, or sitting around gossiping; but fortunately it was a cold night, so most of the people were in their huts. We passed the spot where we had laid the poor sister who had recently died: it was sad to think she was not with us now. We kept steadily moving forward; not a word had passed our lips; the camels had been well fed upon dhrura, and we could scarcely hold them in. I tried to peer through the darkness, while my ear was ready to catch the slightest sound of possible pursuers.

Soon we had left Omdurman far behind, and in the soft sand-bed of Khor Shambat we dismounted to have our saddles rearranged; then we mounted again, and pursued our journey at a rapid pace northward along the river-bank. We were in all seven persons and four camels; the guide Ahmed Hassan, his two friends, Hamed and Awad; Sister Caterina Chincarini and Sister Elisabetta Venturini; myself and Adila.

All night long they rode, sometimes through thorn bushes

and mimosa shrub, still northward along the bank of the river, swerving from the track only when the barking of dogs gave them notice to avoid a village, and with hope that rose ever higher as the lengthening miles separated them from the hated capital of the Mahdists. So swift was the pace, that at day-break they neared a village, Wad Bishara, generally reckoned as two days' journey from Khartoum. The growing light now warned them to turn aside from the river path, which is there the highway of traffic, and push on through the desert, up and down hills, and across long stretches of sand. A momentary halt was made for a frugal meal of biscuit and water, then once more into the saddle and on again. One of the sisters fell from her camel, fainting or insensible ; she was picked up, splashed with water, and made fast to it with ropes while they rode continuously forward, in the desert by day, and on the river-bank by night. No sight or sound betokened pursuit, and Ahmed was able to avert the suspicions of the few wandering Arabs they met by describing in exaggerated terms the disturbances in Omdurman, and representing the party as fugitives from the consequent perils and disorders. They watered at the wells of Gubat where the English Expedition had encamped, and skirted the great village of Metemmeh, the capital of the Jaalin Arabs. All this time they halted only for such brief pause as was required to snatch a hurried meal of dates, biscuits and water, and to allow the camels to consume their ration of dhurra. On the third day they came in sight of Berber, and after cautiously descending to the river-bank to replenish their water skins, made for the desert again.

A critical point of their journey was now approaching, for the Nile had to be crossed, entailing delay and a certain amount of publicity. Fortune again favoured the fugitives : two boys were seen with a large boat, who consented to ferry them across, and after watering the camels they set their faces northwards once more. They had now been four days on the road, and during the whole of that night and the next day they rode on without adventure or mishap, through a lonely desert where antelopes, rabbits, and hyenas were seen, but no human beings. At this stage of the journey, the wonderful endurance of the camels was severely tried, and they began to show signs of fatigue. Their humps had shrunken and become flaccid, while

the racing speed at which they had started was exchanged for a dull plodding gait to which they had to be urged by the whip, so that Father Ohrwalder and the guides often dismounted and walked, in order to relieve them. The weather too had become oppressively hot, and the deceptive mirage, the Bahr-esh-Sheitan, or "River of Satan" as the Arabs call it, was frequently seen.

The greatest danger they encountered was at Meshra Dehes, the last watering-place before entering on the passage of the Korosko Desert, about six miles north of Abu Hamed. Here a frontier guard of the Khalifa wanted to insist on taking them before the emir of the latter place, and though he was eventually bought off, the incident lent wings to their flight by reminding them that they were still within the dominions of the Mahdist empire. The sun burnt fiercely hot as they rode over bare hills and through solitary valleys, striking that evening the trail of what had been the great caravan route from Abu Hamed to Korosko, now deserted, but still marked by the bleaching bones of animals which had perished by the way. The greatest suffering the party had to undergo was from the want of sleep, and the necessity for resisting the heavy drowsiness which overcame them in spite of all devices for keeping it at bay. In vain they tried to shout and talk, or pinched themselves until the blood came; they dozed off from time to time until effectually roused up by nearly dropping from their saddles, while sandy plains and rocky gorges formed a series of nightmare dissolving views unrolled before their clouded brains. But safety was now at hand, for they were nearing the Egyptian frontier station, where rest, food, and welcome were awaiting them.

Just before sunset [says Father Ohrwalder] we turned down the khor which leads to Murat. The fort covering the wells was visible on the hills, surmounted by the red flag with the white crescent and star in the centre. "Ahmed," I cried, "greet the flag of freedom!" And our courageous deliverer seized his gun and fired shot after shot into the air, to announce our arrival to the Egyptian garrison. The echo of these shots resounded again and again in the deep valleys, as if joining with us in our joy at deliverance from the hands of the cruel Khalifa Abdullah. They seemed to announce the "release of our spirits from beneath his sheep-skin." This was an expression which the Khalifa delighted to use when speaking of his captured enemies, whose souls, he said, lay beneath his "furwa," meaning that their lives were entirely in his hands.

The reports of our rifles had at first caused some stir in the little garrison, who feared a sudden attack, and had come out fully armed ; but they soon recognised us, and answered our salute by discharging their guns in the air. These good people received us most kindly, asked us a thousand questions, and surrounding us, brought us to the commandant's hut. Here, on the 8th of December, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, we alighted from our camels, and the hopes which kept us alive for years were at last realised. This supreme moment, about which we had so often talked with our companions in adversity, which we had thought about, dreamed about, and pictured to ourselves—this delicious moment had come at last, and we were free !

They had ridden 500 miles in seven days, almost without rest or sleep, in that terrible time-race, with life and liberty as the prize. They owed both to the skill and fidelity of their Arab guide, as well as to the extraordinary speed and endurance of the camels he had purchased for them. The breakdown of one of these animals would have been fatal, as delay in their case meant inevitable death. Even sleep was banished for a while by the excitement of deliverance, and they sat talking over their adventures with the Arabs, to whom, hardy as they are, the feat of such a journey seemed incredible. After a day's rest, they were able nevertheless to mount again, and pursue their way to Korosko, where the Nile was struck once more, on December 13. Here their wild wanderings ended, for a steamer conveyed them thence to Cairo, and civilisation welcomed them as returned from worse than the grave.

The promised and well-earned reward of £420 was paid to Ahmed Hassan, whose sagacity and foresight had averted all the many dangers of the flight. So well had it been contrived, that the Khalifa, when it was discovered, could learn no news of them along the road, and time was lost by his agents in searching some of the boats bound to Berber. This delay, added to that caused by the necessity for purchasing camels for the pursuit, rendered the latter hopeless from the first, and it was abandoned when it was found that no tidings of the fugitives could be obtained at Metemmeh.

Thus closes for the moment the history of the Missions in the Soudan, since neither the moral nor the material redemption of that unhappy country seems within view at present. How great is its need of deliverance from the dreadful tyranny under which

it groans may be learned from every page of Father Ohrwalder's narrative, which is an exhaustive repertory of information, both as to its actual condition and history during the past ten years. With this mass of valuable information, which he alone is in a position to furnish, is combined the interest of a story of personal adventure such as has fallen to the lot of few travellers, and of strange experiences which, however exceptional, none, we think, will be found to envy. His gifts of keen observation and discriminating power of ordering and selecting the most striking facts, brought to bear on a situation of tragical singularity, have resulted in the production of a book unique of its kind, and well worthy of the permanent place it has attained in contemporary literature.

ELLEN M. CLERKE.

ART. V.—BISHOP LIGHTFOOT AND THE EARLY ROMAN SEE.

II.

IN our former article* it was shown that Bishop Lightfoot recognised these facts concerning St. Peter and the Early Roman Church :

I. Our Lord gave St. Peter a primacy among the Apostles, and the action of this primacy may be seen in the early stages of the history of the Apostolic Church.

II. St. Peter visited Rome and was martyred there.

III. At the close of the first century the Roman Church had a “precedence” or “primacy” among the Churches of Christendom, which becomes more and more distinctly marked during the course of the next two centuries.

It was seen, moreover, that Bishop Lightfoot puts forward three other propositions, each correlated to one of these three statements of fact, and having the practical effect, if established, of neutralising their doctrinal significance.

The first of these correctives was dealt with at some length. The arguments relied on to establish the theory that St. Peter's primacy was transient—a mere “primacy of historical inauguration,” which lapsed of itself on the reception of the Gentiles into the Church—were tested in order, and it was found after the examination that one survived, an argument from the silence of the second part of the Acts about St. Peter. It was then shown how inadequate and even fallacious this argument is. Thus the first of Bishop Lightfoot's correctives fails, there being no evidence of any withdrawal of the prerogative conferred upon St. Peter by Christ. We have now to consider the questions raised as to the nature and consequences of St. Peter's historical connection with the Roman Church.

The second of Bishop Lightfoot's positions may be thus formulated :

* DUBLIN REVIEW, July 1893.

II. Though in Rome, St. Peter never was Bishop of Rom
This is what Bishop Lightfoot brings forward in support of
his view :

Was S. Peter Bishop of Rome at all? He might have been founder or joint founder of the Church there, without having been regarded as its bishop. No one reckons S. Paul as first bishop of Thessalonica or Philippi, of Corinth or of Athens, though these Churches owe their first evangelisation to him.

Now I cannot find that any writers for the first two centuries and more speak of S. Peter as bishop of Rome. Indeed their language is inconsistent with the assignment of this position to him. When Dionysius of Corinth speaks of the Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul as jointly planting the two Churches of Corinth and of Rome, he obviously cannot mean this; for otherwise he would point to a divided episcopate. The language of Irenæus (iii. 3. 3) again is still more explicit. He describes the Church of Rome as founded by the Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul, who appointed Linus bishop. After him came Linus [*sic*]; after Linus, Anencletus; after Anencletus "in the *third* place from the Apostles Clement is elected to the bishopric," and the others, when any numbers are given, are numbered accordingly, so that Xystus is "the sixth from the Apostles," and Eleutherus, the contemporary of Irenæus, "holds the office of the episcopate in the twelfth place from the Apostles." This is likewise the enumeration in the anonymous author of the treatise against Artemon (Euseb. H. E. v. 28), probably Hippolytus, who numbers Victor "the thirteenth from Peter."*

These were the last words Bishop Lightfoot ever wrote. But in another place he has developed more fully the argument founded on the words of St. Irenæus. He there says Irenæus "separates the apostolic founders of the Roman Church from the bishops, and begins the numbering of the latter with Linus"; and that Eusebius "in the numbering of the several bishops always omits the Apostolic founder or founders from the reckoning."†

Here it is laid down that the language of the writers of the first two centuries and more is "inconsistent" with the assignment to St. Peter of the position of Bishop of Rome. We must therefore in the first place see what are the precise terms of the passages on which this statement is based:

Irenæus: "After Anencletus in the third place from the Apostles Clement is appointed to the episcopate"; "Xystus is appointed sixth

* "Clem. Rom." ii. 501, 502.

[No. 8 of Fourth Series.]

† *Ibid.* i. 204, 207.

3 I

from the Apostles"; "Now in the twelfth place from the Apostles Eleutherus holds the office of the episcopate."

Hippolytus (?): Victor was "thirteenth bishop in Rome from Peter."

Eusebius: "First after Peter, Linus obtained the episcopate of the Church of the Romans"; "Clement held the third place of those who were bishops in Rome after Paul and Peter"; "Telesphorus received the bishopric seventh from the Apostles."*

To test whether such language really is inconsistent with the episcopate of the Apostles let us take analogous modes of expression. "First after the Conqueror, William Rufus obtained the Crown of England; after Henry I., in the third place from the Conqueror, Stephen is appointed to the throne; Henry V. was the thirteenth King of England from the Conqueror." In an indifferent case like this all will be ready to admit that such language is not "inconsistent" with the belief that William the Conqueror was King of England, and that it cannot be held to "separate" him from the line of kings. Turning now to the case in hand, a single fact will probably to most minds be enough to show that Bishop Lightfoot's interpretation is not one imposed by the texts in question; for a critic like Lipsius, though believing Eusebius to be mistaken as to the fact, thinks that by his words about Linus, just quoted, the Roman episcopate of St. Peter is "expressly asserted."† It will be seen that the passages quoted from Irenæus, Hippolytus (?), and Eusebius are perfectly parallel, and it is impossible to make a real distinction in thought between them. If such contrary interpretations can be given by qualified critics, and if in a parallel case, such as that instanced above, no inconsistency is found, it would appear that Bishop Lightfoot has been somewhat precipitate in inferring from such language in itself exclusion or separation.

But we must go a step further forward and point out that Irenæus is urging against heretics, as a palmary argument, the authority of apostolic teaching and tradition as handed down in churches founded by Apostles, and showing how that apostolic authority in these churches is to be arrived at. He does not say in general terms, "Hear the Church of Rome, because it was founded by the Apostles Peter and Paul"; but

* "Clem. Rom.," i. 156, 204, 206, 207, 271.

† "Dictionary of Christian Biography," i. 26.

He expressly narrows the source of authority by placing the evidence and guarantee of the tradition in the succession of bishops, as the channel whereby it flowed from its apostolic fountain-head. Now the force of his argument depends precisely on the fact that there is no break, above all at the critical point of contact with the Apostles. And so it is impossible to suppose that Irenæus had in mind any idea of separating the apostolic founders of the Roman Church from the line of bishops.

But to pass from the mere criticism of forms of expression and of run of thought to the substance of the matter. The language of Irenæus and Eusebius in speaking of the bishops of Rome (and Eusebius does the same in the case of other Apostolic Sees, *e.g.*, Antioch and Alexandria), as being the third or the twelfth “from the Apostles,” can be satisfactorily accounted for on two hypotheses, and on two only: either the apostles were bishops, and something more than mere bishops, or else they were not bishops at all. The latter would be Bishop Lightfoot’s explanation, for to him—

The episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localisation, but out of the presbyterial by elevation. . . . The functions of the Apostle and the bishop differed widely. The Apostle . . . held no *local* office. He was essentially, as his name denotes, a missionary, moving about from place to place, founding and confirming new brotherhoods. . . . It is not, therefore, to the apostle that we must look for the prototype of the bishop. How far indeed and in what sense the bishop may be called a successor of the Apostles will be a proper subject for consideration: but the succession at least does not consist in an identity of office.*

The promise here held out was not fulfilled; but as to Bishop Lightfoot’s opinion there can be no doubt; it is summed up in the marginal note: “Bishops: the office not a continuation of the apostolate”; and still more categorically in the index: “Apostles not bishops.”

It would be impossible to enter here on any discussion of the Christian ministry in apostolic times—a question on which a recent Catholic writer well says: “To some the ecclesiastical organisation in this early age seems full-blown episcopalianism;

* “Dissertations,” 154, 155. The author’s view underwent no modification to the end (*Ibid.*, 212, 243).

to others stark presbyterianism; while others see in it democracy pure and simple. Of course, unless there were a large field over which speculation might freely roam, such strange diversity would be impossible.”* But it may be observed that Bishop Lightfoot seems never to have faced the other alternative—viz., whether the apostles were bishops and something more, and whether the difference between the two was one of degree and circumstances rather than kind. It must be remembered that he holds that neither apostles, bishops, nor presbyters were priests, and that the sacerdotal conception of the Christian ministry is a later perversion.† In his eyes all Christian ministers have, from the beginning, been merely officers; and, of course, from this point of view, there can be no question as to “character,” but only as to “functions,” and a difference of function would constitute a difference of office.‡ Of course, if none of the apostles were bishops, it logically follows that St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome. But persons who quote Bishop Lightfoot’s authority for the statement that St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome, must bear in mind his premisses. This, however, is hardly an historical settlement of the question.

Let it therefore be considered what would be the natural position of an apostle residing in a church, either permanently or for a notable period of time. Clement of Alexandria gives a description of St. John’s life at Ephesus, which Bishop Lightfoot accepts as authentic, and thus sums up: “Here he gathered disciples about him, ordained bishops and presbyters, founded new churches, making Ephesus his headquarters, but visiting the neighbouring districts as occasion required.”§ St. Clement of Rome also tells us that the apostles, “preaching everywhere in country and town, appointed their first-fruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and

* Schanz, “Apology,” iii. 145 (trans.).

† “Dissertations,” 210–238.

‡ It is curious that Bishop Lightfoot did not see that if there be any representative of the Apostle in the existing Church, even from the mere point of view of functions, it is the Catholic bishop, within the limits of his diocese. Of course in the Anglican Church this is much obscured on the one hand by the survival of late mediæval ecclesiastical conditions as to benefices, and on the other by the narrowed and weakened conception of the bishop’s position in the Church and his office.

§ “Ign. and Polyc.,” i. 440.

deacons unto them that should believe.”* That an apostle, wherever he was, would ordain to the ministry can hardly need formal proof. By the very nature of things the apostle would be the teacher and guide of the community in which he lived ; to him all would instinctively turn to make known the truth in all difficulties of doctrine and practice ; he would take the leading part at meetings, whether for worship and prayer, or for other purposes ; he would direct everything, and be in the fullest sense the ruler of that church. In a word, he would be the source and centre of all authority and spiritual power, the chief and immediate pastor of the flock. Even though “absent in body,” St. Paul stood in a position much like this to the Corinthian Church. And what is all this but a description of the episcopal office in the exercise of its twofold powers of order and jurisdiction, in the only sense conceivable in those primitive times.†

Putting aside, as of course we are bound to do in the present case, the concurrent testimony and belief of the Church from the third century, and restricting ourselves to the narrow and technical ground which the discussion raised here imposes upon us. the question practically resolves itself into this : Did St. Peter take up his residence in Rome for a period of time sufficient for the assumption and exercise of the apostolic and episcopal position and powers ?

According to Bishop Lightfoot, St. Paul arrived in Rome in the spring of 61. After two years’ imprisonment he was released, and Bishop Lightfoot gives what seem very strong reasons for supposing he then left Rome.‡ After an interval he returned and was martyred, probably in 67. During St. Paul’s absence, Bishop Lightfoot would place St. Peter’s visit to Rome, thus accounting for the fact that no mention of him is made by the writer of the Acts, or by St. Paul in the various epistles written during his imprisonment. St. Peter’s stay in Rome he would limit to a few months, supposing that he

* “Ep. ad Cor.,” § 42 ; cf. also St. Paul’s Pastoral Epistles.

† The root of Bishop Lightfoot’s difficulties lies in the fact that he is unable to conceive of a “bishop” in any other sense than the one which is exhausted by the statement that regiment by bishops is historically an apostolic institution, and (if people will proceed further) so far “divine.” That is to say, episcopacy is recommended merely historically but not doctrinally.

‡ “Clem. Rom.,” ii. 30 (note).

arrived there in the second half of 63 and was martyred in the following year.* Thus, on our author's theory, the two apostles were not in Rome at the same time. He thinks that St. Peter had never visited Rome before this occasion. Other writers, of course, think that the phenomena of the case postulate an earlier visit, and that St. Peter was the founder of the Roman Church. Into this question we shall not enter, for whether St. Peter dwelt in Rome twenty-five years, or only one, is a matter of complete indifference to the point under investigation.†

St. Peter in Rome would ordain ministers like any other Apostle, as occasion arose. He would be ruler of the church there. Of this St. Ignatius gives testimony, saying to the Romans, "I will not command you, like Peter and Paul."‡ Even curtailing his stay in Rome to the narrowest possible limits, and making it to have been only a few months, that would allow ample time for him to have exercised the episcopal office; the fact of his staying till his death favours the idea that he had taken up his permanent residence there; lastly, there was no other apostle in Rome at the time. From all that has been said, we think it appears that the nature of the case points strongly to the conclusion that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome in a very true sense, a conclusion in accord with the early tradition of the Roman Church itself.

For, if Bishop Lightfoot's surmise, which he seems to support by good reasons, and which is accepted by Dr. Salmon,§ is true, viz., that the list of Roman bishops given by St. Epiphanius is none other than the one drawn up at Rome by

* "Clem. Rom.," ii. 497.

† But one curious fact we must point out. Bishop Lightfoot says: "The Epistle to the Romans was written about A.D. 58. During this period no Apostle had visited the metropolis of the world. If silence can ever be regarded as decisive, its verdict must be accepted in this case. S. Paul could not have written as he writes to the Romans (i. 11 *sey.*, xv. 20-24), if they had received even a short visit from an Apostle, more especially if that Apostle were S. Peter" ("Clem. Rom.," ii. 491). Thus Bishop Lightfoot; on the other hand, Baur thought this same passage (Rom. xv. 20-24) contained such unanswerable evidence of St. Peter's *having* been in Rome, that while accepting the Epistle to the Romans as genuine, he characteristically declared the fifteenth chapter to be spurious (Hagemann, "Die Römische Kirche in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten," 659). This contrast we venture to think is an instructive lesson on the dangers of subjective criticism and of the argument from silence.

‡ "Epistle to the Romans," § 4.

§ "Infallibility of the Church," 359.

Hegesippus, then we have a writer in the middle of the second century thus recording the tradition of the Roman Church itself as to the succession of its bishops: "Peter and Paul, Linus and Cletus, Clement," and so forth.*

It will have been noticed that the passages from Ignatius and Irenæus, and still more formally the one just quoted, tell equally strongly in favour of the idea that St. Paul also had been bishop of Rome. Bishop Lightfoot once looked with some favour on the hypothesis that in the beginning two Christian communities, a Jewish and a Gentile, each with its own bishop, co-existed in Rome, and that they were united under St. Clement; but in his later years he rejected this idea.† According to his account, the two apostles were never in Rome at the same time; and so there need be no difficulty about "a divided episcopate." The peculiar circumstances of St. Paul's life and vocation suggest reasons why, as Bishop Lightfoot points out, he is not reckoned as first bishop of churches like Corinth and Philippi, which owed their first evangelisation to him. His life was that of a wandering missioner, travelling ceaselessly from city to city, founding churches wherever he went, and then passing on and leaving it to others to develop and govern the communities he established. "I planted; Apollos watered." Even as regards Rome, though his stay was prolonged, it was the involuntary detention of a prisoner on parole, and he ever looked forward

* "Clem. Rom.," i. 327-333. Mr. Puller, in his "Primitive Saints and the Roman See," says: "The real inventor of the story of St. Peter's Roman episcopate appears to have been the unknown heretic w.h.o wrote the romance" [*i.e.*, the Clementine Recognitions]; adding in a note, "apparently Bishop Lightfoot agrees" in this view. In the passage referred to by Mr. Puller, Bishop Lightfoot says nothing of the kind, nor anything at all like it. Indeed, it may be said without offence that Mr. Puller's treatment of the Recognitions is proper to pass muster with those only (and they are doubtless the majority) who know nothing of the subject. In contrast with Mr. Puller's convenient polemical certainties, it may be well to listen to the words of a master on such matters. "In regard to this document almost everything is still shrouded in obscurity. The one point on which some years ago there seemed agreement—viz., as to its originating c. 150-170—is not only open to the gravest objections, but can be shown to be erroneous. In their present form the Recognitions and Homilies belong, not to the second century, but to the first half of the third; nor is there anything which hinders our placing them some twenty years later." So Harnack ("Dogmengeschichte," i. 266), who cites as agreeing in this view Zahn, Lagarde, Lipsius, and Weingarten. Under these circumstances a revision of so much of Mr. Puller's book as is concerned with the Clementine documents would seem desirable.

† *Ibid.*, i. 68.

to leaving Rome as soon as he could (Philip. i. 25, ii. 24; Philemon, 22). Left to himself, and not under the control of circumstances, doubtless in themselves providential, his residence in Rome would have been but a passing call (Rom. xv. 24, 28). With the comparative freedom of "his own hired dwelling," he would naturally exercise apostolic powers, especially if no other apostle were there at the time; but on his enlargement he probably left Rome. Thus, it is easy to see, on the one hand, how St. Paul came to be counted among her bishops by the tradition of the Roman Church in the middle of the second century, as recorded by Hegesippus and Irenæus; and on the other hand, how he fell out of the list not long after, as appears from the catalogue of Hippolytus, c. 230.* These circumstances really present no difficulty whatever: they do not affect the question whether St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. So far as that point is concerned, the question whether or no St. Paul also was one of her bishops, is a matter of complete indifference; if he was, that is but an additional glory.

The fact of the matter is that a vast deal of more or less learned dust has been raised on the point; all that is wanted is a little straight looking at the facts, so far as they are known, and the likelihoods of the case, and then a plain common-sense judgment. Such a process will, we believe, lead most men to the conclusion that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome in an adequate sense. Let Dr. Lipsius speak, a sturdy rationalist, who has made a special study of the early Roman Church and her bishops:

If ever the Prince of the Apostles set foot in the eternal city, he certainly did not go as a simple traveller, but in virtue of his apostolic power; and his martyrdom, in that case, forms but the glorious ending of his official labour among the Romans. And if, as many Protestants also hold, the episcopate is of divine institution, then the claim of the Roman Church to trace her episcopal succession back to Peter is, after all, not so very absurd.†

Having now examined into St. Peter's primacy and his Roman episcopate, we next proceed to consider Bishop Lightfoot's third position, which we thus formulated:

* "Clem. Rom.," i. 258-262.

† Cited in Schanz, "Apology," iii. 476 (trans.).

III. The primacy of the Roman Church was not originally due to any primacy of her bishops, but to other causes; and the later primacy of the Bishop of Rome grew out of the early primacy of his Church.

The following extracts, in which the author deals with the letters of St. Clement and St. Ignatius, contain his argument on this head. St. Ignatius' letter to the Romans

is addressed to the Church of Rome. It assigns to this Church a pre-eminence of rank as well as of love (inser.). . . . With all this importance attributed to the Romish Church, it is the more remarkable that not a word is said about the Roman bishop. Indeed there is not even the faintest hint that a bishop of Rome existed at this time. To ourselves the Church of Rome has been so entirely merged in the Bishop of Rome, that this silence is the more surprising. Yet startling as this omission is, it entirely accords with the information derived from other trustworthy sources. All the ancient notices point to the mature development of episcopacy in Asia Minor at this time. On the other hand, all the earliest notices of the Church in Rome point in the opposite direction. In the Epistle of Clement, which was written a few years before these Ignatian letters purport to be penned, there is no mention of the bishop. The letter is written in the name of the Church; it speaks with the authority of the Church. It is strenuous, even peremptory, in the authoritative tone which it assumes; but it pleads the authority not of the chief minister, but of the whole body. The next document emanating from the Roman Church after the assumed date of the Ignatian Epistles, is the Shepherd of Hermas. Here again we are met with similar phenomena. If we had no other information, we should be at a loss to say what was the form of Church government at Rome when the Shepherd was written. . . . The episcopate, though doubtless it existed in some form or other in Rome, had not yet (it would seem) assumed the same sharp and well-defined monarchical character with which we are confronted in the Eastern Churches.*

Of St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians he says:

The language of this letter, though itself inconsistent with the possession of papal authority in the person of the writer, enables us to understand the secret of the growth of papal domination. It does not proceed from the Bishop of Rome, but from the Church of Rome. There is every reason to believe the early tradition which points to S. Clement as its author, and yet he is not once named. The first person plural is maintained throughout, "We consider," "We have sent." Accordingly, writers of the second century speak of it as a letter from the community, not from the individual. [Dionysius of Corinth, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria.] . . . The name and personality of Clement are absorbed

* "Ign. and Polyc.", i. 398, 399.

in the Church of which he is the spokesman. [Here follows the passage quoted in the previous article, contrasting Pope Victor at the end of the second century with St. Clement at the end of the first.] Even this second stage has carried the power of Rome only a very small step in advance towards the assumptions of a Hildebrand or an Innocent or a Boniface, or even of a Leo: but it is nevertheless a decided step. The substitution of the bishop of Rome for the Church of Rome is an all-important point. The later Roman theory supposes that the Church of Rome derives all its authority from the bishop of Rome, as the successor of S. Peter.* History inverts this relation and shows that, as a matter of fact, the power of the bishop of Rome was built upon the power of the Church of Rome. It was originally a primacy, not of the episcopate, but of the church. . . . [In St. Ignatius' Letter to the Church of Rome], though Clement's letter is apparently in his mind, there is no mention of Clement or Clement's successor throughout. Yet at the same time he assigns a primacy to Rome. The church is addressed in the opening salutation as "she who hath the presidency (*προκάθηται*) in the place of the region of the Romans." But immediately afterwards the nature of this supremacy is defined. The presidency of this Church is declared to be a presidency of love (*προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης*). This then was the original primacy of Rome—a primacy not of the bishop, but of the whole church, a primacy not of official authority but of practical goodness, backed however by the prestige and the advantages which were necessarily enjoyed by the church of the metropolis. . . . And so it remains till the close of the second century. When, some seventy years later than the date of our epistle, a second letter is written from Rome to Corinth during the episcopate of Soter (about A.D. 165–175), it is still written in the name of the Church, not the bishop, of Rome, and as such is acknowledged by Dionysius of Corinth. "We have read your letter" (*ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν*), he writes in reply to the Romans. At the same time he bears a noble testimony to that moral ascendancy of the early Roman Church which was the historical foundation of its primacy: "This hath been your practice from the beginning: to do good to all the brethren in various ways, and to send supplies (*ἐφόδια*) to many churches in divers cities, in one place recruiting the poverty of those that are in want, in another assisting brethren that are in the mines by the supplies that ye have been in the habit of sending to them from the first, thus keeping up, as becometh Romans, a hereditary practice of Romans, which your blessed bishop Soter hath not only maintained, but also advanced," with more to the same effect.†

The evidence recited in these extracts, based on the writings of St. Clement, St. Ignatius and Hermas, has been enough to persuade many writers of name—among them Harnack—that

* To avoid ambiguities in view of the further treatment of the question I add "Yes; so far as *jus* is concerned."

† "Clem. Rom.," i. 69–72.

a presbyterian form of government without any monarchical bishop existed in the Roman Church until towards the middle of the second century. This view, however, need not delay us here, for Bishop Lightfoot declares definitely against it.* Our author's matured view is that, though there was a monarchical bishop of Rome from the beginning, still "there are grounds for surmising that the bishops of Rome were not at the time raised so far above their presbyters as in the Churches of the East"; that "the episcopate, though doubtless it existed in some form or other in Rome, had not yet (it would seem) assumed the same sharp and well-defined monarchical character with which we are confronted in the Eastern Churches."†

We would be quite ready to discuss the evidence with those who maintain that there were no bishops of Rome until the middle of the second century; but really, when it becomes a mere question of the degree of monarchical character of the Roman bishops as compared with others, it seems to us that the distinction, where after all so little evidence is forthcoming, is somewhat fine-drawn; and we are therefore disposed to say *transeat*—to allow Bishop Lightfoot's contention for sake of argument. We shall therefore assume that, though the early Roman Church was the most important in Christendom, still the position of the Roman bishop, as distinct from the body of his Church, is not until the middle of the second century so prominent or clearly defined as in other Churches. Let us see how the case looks from this standpoint. It must be recollected, to adopt the words of Cardinal Newman, written in 1871, that

* "It would be an excess of scepticism, with the evidence before us, to question the existence of the episcopate as a distinct office from the presbyterate in the Roman Church" [at the date of St. Ignatius' Epistles] ("Ign. and Polyc.", i. 395). Again, "Though, so far as I can see, no adequate reason can be advanced why Linus and Anencletus [the two names between St. Peter and St. Clement] should not have been bishops in the later sense, as single rulers of the Church, yet here the tradition, if unsupported by any other considerations, cannot inspire any great confidence. But with Clement the case is different. The testimony of the succeeding ages is strong and united" ("Clem. Rom.", i. 68). Lastly, "As regards the names [Linus and Anencletus] I see no reason to question that they not only represent historical persons, but that they were bishops in the sense of monarchical rulers of the Roman Church, though their monarchy may have been much less autocratic than the episcopate even of the succeeding century" ("Clem. Rom.", i. 340).

† "Ign. and Polyc.", i. 395, 399.

Ignatius witnessed and took part in the establishment of diocesan episcopacy. . . . Hitherto bishops had lived together in community, the apostles exercising a jurisdiction over the whole Church. As time went on, local jurisdiction came into use. In his last years St. Paul placed local ordinaries in Crete and Ephesus and St. John in other cities of Asia Minor, if the seven angels of the churches in the Apocalypse are bishops;* [similarly, as has been seen, SS. Peter and Paul in Rome].

Of course bishops would not be at once appointed in every town where there was a Christian community. The gradual growth of ecclesiastical organisation in a missionary country nowadays will give some idea of what must have taken place. Some churches must have remained longer than others under the management of a presbyter or board of presbyters, and then, as Cardinal Newman goes on to say, when a bishop was appointed, the vindication of his position "was not so much the enforcement of a tradition, as the carrying out of a development." Hence it is natural to suppose that in this process of disengagement the bishop's position would not be everywhere at once fully understood; it would take some time for his authority and powers to be explicitly recognised and legally formulated; and no doubt the process would go on more rapidly in one church or locality than in another, and the full monarchical character of the episcopate would be established sooner here than there. From the mere shreds of evidence that have come down to us, Bishop Lightfoot draws the following conclusions: (1) By the middle of the second century, monarchical episcopacy was well established not only in Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor, but also in Greece, Thrace, Gaul, Africa, and Alexandria, as well as Rome. (2) The development was not simultaneous and equal in all parts of Christendom. (3) It was slower in the West than in the East. (4) It appears in its mature form first in Syria and Asia Minor.† Of course all this is looking at the question from a purely historical standpoint, which is the one we desire to take up. Sharply defined monarchical episcopacy did not, so far as reliance can be placed on extant documents, first

* "Essays, Critical and Historical," i. 251. Bishop Lightfoot does not so understand the Angels of the Churches; but for all that in many places he connects the establishment of episcopacy in Asia Minor with St. John ("The Christian Ministry").

† See the "Essay on the Christian Ministry" ("Dissertations," pp. 166-191); also "Ign. and Polyc.," i. 389-399.

manifest itself at Rome. Had it done so (it may be remarked by the way) there might be some plausibility in attributing the growth of the power and influence of the Roman bishops to personal ambition and other such causes. But historically Rome only kept pace with, perhaps even followed, what was going on all around. “The substitution of the bishop of Rome for the Church of Rome” was no anomaly; it was part of a movement in progress all over Christendom at any rate in the early second century. Everywhere the tendency was to concentrate more and more the whole authority and power of each church in the hands of the bishop, who became the representative of his church, and the monarchical ruler, absorbing in his own person whatever authority and rights had hitherto been enjoyed by the presbyterate or the community, the bishop in each case naturally inheriting the ecclesiastical position that had belonged to his church. And so there was no more aggrandisement or ambition or impropriety in the Bishop of Rome taking that place among bishops which his church had held among churches, than in a bishop of Magnesia or Tralles becoming the monarchical ruler of his own church.

We are thus brought back to the consideration of the position of the Roman Church during the first two centuries. The subject to be investigated is the nature of its primacy, which now is not questioned by any competent scholar, and the origin and reasons of it. Our author, as the foregoing extracts show, has his theories on these points. But before we come to examine them it will be well to have a clear idea of the problem that demands solution. The following chronological conspectus gives in Bishop Lightfoot's own words his conception of the position of the Roman Church and bishop during the second century.

C. A.D. 95.—St. Clement's office as Bishop of Rome was “on any showing” “exceptionally prominent” (“Clem. Rom.,” i. 58, note); his position was that of “the chief ruler of the most important church in Christendom” (*Ibid.* i. 61); his Epistle to the Corinthians, not to any suburbicarian church, is “urgent and almost imperious” (*Ibid.* i. 69); “it speaks with the authority of the Church,” and “is strenuous, even peremptory, in the authoritative tone it assumes” (“Ign. and Polyc.,” i. 398). And so this, the first document emanating

from the Roman Church, is also “the first step towards papal domination” (“Clem. Rom.,” i. 70).

C. A.D. 110.—St. Ignatius “assigns a primacy to Rome” (*Ibid.*, i. 71); he “assigns to this Church a pre-eminence of rank as well as of love” (“Ign. and Polyc.,” i. 398).

C. A.D. 150.—Hegesippus and Irenæus resided for some considerable time at Rome soon after the middle of the second century (“Clem. Rom.,” i. 202–3). “The succession of the bishops of Rome is with them the chief guarantee of the transmission of the orthodox doctrine” (“Ign. and Polyc.,” i. 399).

C. A.D. 170.—In the Epitaph of Abercius, a Phrygian bishop, “we shall naturally interpret the queen as denoting the Roman Church” (“Ign. and Polyc.,” i. 498–9).

C. A.D. 180.—St. Irenæus by his *potentior principalitas* assigns to the Roman Church “a certain precedence . . . over the other churches of Christendom” (*Ibid.*, ii. 191, note).

C. A.D. 190.—“The close of the second century witnessed the autocratic pretensions of the haughty Pope Victor,” “the first also who advanced those claims to universal dominion which his successors in later ages have always consistently and often successfully maintained” (“Dissertations,” 186).

And so by the end of the second century “the substitution of the Bishop of Rome for the Church of Rome” is an accomplished fact (“Clem. Rom.,” i. 70).*

Here are the phenomena to be accounted for as they appear to Bishop Lightfoot. And how does he account for them? The original primacy of Rome, he contends, was “a primacy not of official authority, but of practical goodness, backed however by the prestige and the advantages which were necessarily enjoyed by the church of the metropolis.”† A perusal of the whole passage, which has been cited above (p. 846), will show that this theory is founded upon one single fact, viz., the expression of St. Ignatius in addressing the Roman Church as *προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης*, which is

* We may observe that the facts of the case are set forth still more fully and strongly by Harnack in his remarkable excursus “Katholisch und Römisch” (“Dogmengeschichte,” i. 400–412). Like Bishop Lightfoot, he holds that the primacy originally belonged to the Roman Church, not the Roman bishop—a position necessarily following from his view of the origin and nature of episcopacy.

† “Clem. Rom.,” i. 71.

taken as meaning that this church has “the presidency of love,” *i.e.*, that she takes the lead in “practical goodness,” in works of charity to other churches, and so forth. The letter of Dionysius of Corinth, half a century later, is quoted in illustration, but, as has been said, the theory rests on the passage of St. Ignatius alone. Two questions at once arise : is this the true interpretation of the language ? and, if so, does it account for the phenomena to be explained ?

Among recent critics, Zahn agrees with Bishop Lightfoot,* but Döllinger, Hefele, Funk, Schanz, and especially Hagemann, who discusses the point learnedly, and more in detail than the others, all contend that the proposed interpretation is inadmissible, and that η $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$ here means the “Brotherhood,” the whole Church.[†] Harnack does not decide between the two interpretations, apparently thinking that either may be the real meaning of the words.[‡] Thus Bishop Lightfoot’s theory of the main cause of the Roman primacy is founded at best on a doubtful rendering of a single passage.

To leave the question of language, and come to that of fact, does the theory commend itself as intrinsically satisfactory ? Is it likely that works of charity and “practical goodness,” “sending supplies to many churches,” and “recruiting the poverty of those in want,” and “assisting brethren that are in the mines,” could have been carried out on such a scale by the Roman Church in the first century, as to have made her, by the year 100, “the most important Church in Christendom,” and to have won for her a recognised “precedence of rank,” and to have warranted her in interfering in the affairs of another apostolic church of first rank with a tone of authority ? Do we not feel at once that there is no proportion between the alleged cause and the effects to be accounted for ?

But this is a good example of the hypotheses put forward

* “Patrum Apost. Op.” ed. Gebhardt—Harnack—Zahn, *Fasc. ii. 57.*

† Döllinger, “Hist. of the Church,” i. 255 (trans.) ; Hefele, “Patr. Apost. Op.” (ed. Migne, 1857), *in loc.* ; Funk, “Op. Patr. Apost.” (ed. 1881), *in loc.* ; Schanz, “Apology,” iii. 481 (trans.) ; Hagemann, “Die Römische Kirche,” 687. It may be objected that all these writers are Catholic ; in the same way it may be replied that Bishop Lightfoot is an Anglican. And we venture to think that their names and their reputations, no less than his, are a guarantee that none of them would allow himself for any polemical purposes to distort a piece of evidence.

‡ “Der Vorsitz in der Liebe, sei es nun in dem Liebesbunde oder bei den Liebeswerken” (“Dogmengeschichte,” i. 404, note).

by highly competent writers to explain on exclusively natural grounds the rise and growth of the Roman primacy. Of all the explanations attempted, we cannot help thinking that Bishop Lightfoot's is among the most superficial; and those which go deeper only land us in greater difficulties. To take two representative writers, one German, the other English: The Roman Church was the first to have a fixed baptismal creed, and to promulgate it as the apostolic rule by which all must be measured, hence the Roman Church was recognised as being able, with special precision, to discriminate between the true and the false. She first had a fixed canon of the New Testament. The idea of the apostolic succession of bishops was first brought into prominence in connection with the Roman Church. The Eastern Churches received from a Roman bishop, "and probably rightly," the code of apostolic constitutions for ecclesiastical organisation.* The Roman Church was trusted for its traditional immunity from heretical speculations. It was a typical Church, a sample Church, a miniature of the whole body, and by referring to it, one could see what was held by all.†

But these are no explanations of the phenomena under investigation. They only force the question a step further back. We instinctively ask, How is it that this congeries of very remarkable facts is to be found in this one church, and in no other? Can any reason be assigned why this Roman Church should have been thus highly privileged? The facts set forth are not the causes of her primacy, but its results. They are its manifestation in actual practice; and to put them forward as its causes is surely to argue in a vicious circle. They remind us of Gibbon's famous "secondary causes" of the rapid spread of Christianity, which are true enough, and no doubt did materially help to bring about the great result; but the very existence of which, and much more their combination, are part of the phenomena that demand explanation.

There is, however, one way of accounting for the primacy which deserves special attention, both because it would be really a cause and not a result; and also because it is regarded by

* Harnack, "Dogmengeschichte," i. 401-3.

† Bright, "Roman Claims tested by Antiquity."

Bishop Lightfoot, and, indeed, universally by non-Catholic writers, as a potent factor, if not the chief factor, in the evolution of the Papacy; and that is the theory that the ecclesiastical primacy of Rome among churches was but the corollary of her civil primacy among cities—that the church of the capital of the Roman Empire became as a matter of course the primatial church of Christendom. This naturally is the view of constitutional historians, of whom Professor Bryce, in his "Holy Roman Empire," may be taken as an example. It is evident that the imperial position of Rome with all its associations and prestige would make it, naturally speaking, much easier for the church of Rome than for any other church to become the head of the Christian commonwealth, and to exercise a primacy. All this is true, and we would even wish to urge its force; for the presence of a supernatural and primary cause cannot be held to exclude the operation of others, natural and secondary—indeed it is the ordinary course of Providence to make use of such causes as helps in working out its designs. But the point at issue is precisely this: Are the civil position of Rome, and the bountiful generosity of the Roman Church, and so on, sufficient *of themselves* to account for the primacy of that church in the form in which it already presents itself in the course of the second century? For we must emphasize the fact that it is a question, not of the fourth century, but of the second. The result of the labours of the modern school of ecclesiastical historians has been to throw back this question, and others, two centuries, whereby the case assumes a complexion and urgency of which the older generation of scholars had no conception. Had the primacy emerged into the light of day and taken shape for the first time when Christianity had become the State religion, no doubt a good case might be made out; but seeing that by the end of the second century it is clearly to be discerned in all its main outlines, there simply is not time for the process of evolution postulated on such theories. Let it be considered also that the Roman Church of the first two centuries was composed for the most part of Greeks and Orientals, of slaves and freedmen, with occasionally a few persons moving in the higher, or even highest, circles of society;* is it reasonable to suppose that this

* Cf. "Clem. Rom.," i. 33, 61-2; "Ign. and Polyc.," i. 536, 370.

insignificant, suspected and contemned section of the population could by the mere prestige of the city have been invested with an authority analogous to that of the capital and seat of government of the world? As soon as we set ourselves to realise what is postulated on this theory, and test it by a supposed parallel case in our own day, we feel the difficulties involved. And even supposing the political prestige of the city could thus insensibly communicate itself from the pagan state to the Christian church in matter of pre-eminence and government, it is still harder to see how any such considerations could have given rise to the peculiar doctrinal authority recognised by Harnack and Lightfoot as having belonged to the Roman Church already in the second century.

Passing from the abstract question whether or not the Roman primacy might have arisen in this way, to the question of fact did it so arise, we are confronted with the fact that not a trace of this notion is to be found among the writers of the time; on the contrary, they held quite distinctly a very different theory. In their eyes the greatest weight in the settlement of questions of faith was attached to the traditions and teaching of the apostolic churches; to this principle Irenæus and Tertullian have recourse again and again in their controversies with the heretics. And the reason for this appeal is by no means the civil importance of the cities in which such churches exist, but simply and solely the fact that they had been founded by apostles. Now among all apostolic churches both these writers single out the Church of Rome as being in a special way apostolic, in a special way a witness to the orthodox faith. And they both assign the same reason for this pre-eminence of the Roman Church among apostolic churches—viz., that it was founded and presided over by the two greatest apostles, SS. Peter and Paul. Writers like Irenæus and Tertullian must be accepted as at any rate representing the ideas, the tone of thought, the feeling of their own times, and all the more so from the fact that they use this as their chief and most convincing argument in controversy with heretics. And that tone of thought, of feeling, is the outcome of ideas and reasons of a character essentially religious, providential (and here lies too the root of our own difference with Protestant writers like Bishop Lightfoot), and not

ideas and reasons merely secular, civil, accidental. Moreover, we venture to think that the living belief of the early Church, thus evidenced by these well-informed writers, is in a matter of this kind more likely to be true than the speculations of even the most keen-sighted critics of the nineteenth century, worked up as they are in the solitude of the study out of scanty records, eked out by the intuitions and, it may be, the prejudices of their originators. The primitive theory recommends itself by its simplicity; nay, it admits even of mathematical statement: As "the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul" are to the other apostles, so is "that greatest, most ancient and illustrious church," "founded and constituted" by them at Rome, to other apostolic churches.* The reason assigned by Irenaeus and Tertullian for the peculiar pre-eminence of the Roman Church is the same, but existing in a supereminent degree, as the reason they assign for the pre-eminence enjoyed by all apostolic churches. Whatever ingenuity may be employed in the attempt to give plausibility to the modern theory, there can be no question of the fact that, so far as extant evidence can be relied on, it was quite unknown in primitive times, and must be pronounced unhistorical.

To proceed a step further. The second-century conception of the primacy of the Roman Church attributed it to the fact that that church had been founded and taught and presided over by the two apostles, SS. Peter and Paul. But the same might be said of Antioch and (probably) of Corinth. There must, therefore, have been some unique element in their connection with Rome. It will hardly be maintained that their martyrdom at Rome is the determining factor of which we are in search. Lastly, is it Peter or is it Paul who in the ultimate analysis will prove to be the solution of the problem? We cannot help thinking that an unmistakable answer is given to this question by, so to say, the instinctive working of the inner consciousness of the Roman Church herself, in allowing the Doctor of the Gentiles to fall out of the list of her bishops in the early years of the third century, while the Prince of the Apostles ever grew more and more into prominence. Nor can

* The expressions in inverted commas are from the famous passage of St. Irenaeus ("Adv. Haer.," iii. 3).

this process be attributed to Ebionism, a tendency of which, according to Bishop Lightfoot,* no traces are to be found at Rome. On the other hand, is there any historical fact which differentiates St. Peter from St. Paul, and marks out the former as a source of authority in a way which cannot be predicated of the latter? And thus at length we are led up to the Catholic explanation of the primacy of Rome, the historical side of which may be briefly formulated as follows :

(A) A pre-eminence, a primacy, was conferred on St. Peter by our Lord. We have endeavoured throughout these investigations to confine ourselves to the domain of history, without entering on any doctrinal considerations, and so no attempt has been made to determine the nature of this primacy. We are quite satisfied to accept Bishop Lightfoot's version of what the Petrine texts gave to St. Peter. Not only is it the case that "he holds the first place in all the lists," but "above all he receives special pastoral charges."† It would be difficult to express more tersely or to bring out more fully in so few words the significance of our Lord's three great utterances to St. Peter. This is precisely what is meant by a primacy, not merely of honour or leadership, but also of jurisdiction. Once it is granted that St. Peter ever held such a primacy, it must be assumed that he retained it, until positive proof to the contrary is forthcoming. And in the previous article the insufficiency of the reasons brought forward to show that it was temporary was dwelt upon at some length.

(B) St. Peter, towards the end of his life, if not before, made his way to that very city which all the circumstances of the time, as well as the genius of its people for rule and administration, united in pointing out as the natural seat of a primacy over Christendom ; he took up his residence there, constituted, and presided over the Christian community ; and, except on the hypothesis that the apostles were not bishops, he must be regarded as, in an adequate sense, Bishop of Rome.

(C) On its first appearance on the stage of history, only thirty years after St. Peter's martyrdom, the Roman Church is already the most prominent church of Christendom ; its

* "Dissertations," 93-103.

† "Clem. Rom.," ii. 481.

primacy is recognised throughout the course of the second century by writers in different countries ; its succession of bishops is looked to as the chief guarantee of the transmission of the orthodox doctrine ; the first articulate voice that issues from the mouth of one of its bishops is the first step to Papal domination ; the second, a century later, is a claim to universal dominion. "Vera incessu patuit dea!"

Thus we have three unmistakable historical facts :

St. Peter's primacy.

His connection with the Roman Church as bishop.

The primacy of that church from the dawn of Christian history.

The question comes to this : Are we to look upon these as three isolated facts, and to beat about for independent sets of causes to account for them ; or are we to conceive of them as organically connected, so that the third is the natural outcome of the other two ? We cannot help thinking that the latter alternative is at once the simpler, the more logical, and the one more in accord with ascertained facts, and with primitive beliefs.

E. CUTHBERT BUTLER, O.S.B.

ART. VI.—THE HON. CHARLES LANGDALE.

III.

THE Poor School Committee, or, as it is now called, “the School Committee,” has lasted so long, and has done so much good that it will have a distinguished place in the history of the Church in England in the nineteenth century. It would, therefore, be a matter of interest to know with whom the idea of the committee originated. On this point I am quite unable to inform the reader. The first time I heard of the intended formation of the committee was from Mr. Langdale, who merely said that the bishops were going to establish a committee nominated by themselves, to take the place of the Educational Committee of the Catholic Institute, which was about to be dissolved. I believe he added at the same time, that the committee would consist of one clergyman and two laymen from each of the districts of England. Such, however, was the constitution of the committee, and so it has remained to the present day.* In a matter which comes under the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical authority, as Christian education does, but where the help of laymen is needed or required in order to carry out details, some of great, and others of less importance, it certainly seems to be a wise provision that the laymen to act should be named by the bishops, and, under the supervision of their lordships, should be allowed to proceed with freedom in all those details which do not require the interposition of spiritual authority.

The duties of the new committee were to be much the same as those of the Educational Committee of the Institute, and might be divided into two heads: the distribution of the funds at the discretion of the committee, and the office of being the organ of communication between the Government and the Vicars Apostolic.

The Poor School Committee may be said to have been

* Since the above was written Mr. George Blount, who was a member of the Educational Committee of the Catholic Institute, has told me that he thinks the idea of the Poor School Committee had its origin in a conversation between Mr. Langdale and Bishop Wiseman.

founded on the 27th of September in the year 1847. There does not appear to have been any formal document constituting the committee. The vicars apostolic, it would seem, first agreed amongst themselves on the constitution of the committee ; they then applied to certain priests and laymen in their respective districts requesting them to represent the district on the committee. Their lordships then wrote a joint address to the chairman and members of the acting committee of the Catholic Institute, in which, after speaking of their own obligation to watch over the religious education of the poor, and the special circumstances which rendered vigilance most necessary at that time, they continue as follows :

But however great be our solicitude and anxious our desires, our endeavours in our present circumstances must be comparatively fruitless, unless we have the zealous and unremitting co-operation of others in this good work. We hail, then, with peculiar satisfaction, the zealous co-operation of the gentlemen, lay and clerical, who, from each of our respective districts, have kindly consented to assist us in this great work of education ; and we desire to have intimated to her Majesty's Government that we approve of them as our organ of communication on the subject of education. We subjoin a list of the names of these gentlemen, and we respectfully recommend that you, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, members of the acting committee of the Institute, will, without any unnecessary delay, cause to be passed over to the credit of the gentlemen of the subjoined list whatever sum of money may be standing in your books exclusively for the purpose of education, it being the unanimous intention of the Bishops to carry on henceforward the great work of the religious education of the children of the poor by the assistance, and through the instrumentality, of this new subjoined committee.

Then follow the names of the gentlemen appointed by the bishops as above mentioned—that is, one priest and two laymen for each of the eight districts into which England was then divided.*

Such was the origin of the Poor School Committee. In its formation, that is by the Bishops ; in its representative character, being chosen equally from each of the eight districts ;

* In the first article on "Charles Langdale" (DUBLIN REVIEW, October 1892, p. 395), the writer represented himself as being the last survivor of the original Poor School Committee. This was a mistake. In the list of names mentioned above, and which was sent by the bishops to the acting committee of the Catholic Institute, occurs the name of "The Rev. W. J. Vaughan," the present venerable Bishop of Plymouth, who, with the Hon. Charles Clifford and Edward Weld, Esq., both deceased, represented the Western District.

in the liberty which their lordships allowed the committee to act when the immediate exercise of episcopal authority was not required; in the extreme caution with which the committee acted, and the fidelity with which it always referred important or doubtful matters to the bishops, this committee may, probably, be considered as a model whenever the ecclesiastical authorities in Great Britain wish to engage both clergy and laity to work together in a matter intimately connected with religion. Before the recommendation of the bishops to pay over to the new committee the balance held by the Institute for the purposes of education could be carried out, it was necessary to have the authority of the Institute at a public meeting. The Institute was, as we have seen, to be dissolved; and an association, to be called "The Association of St. Thomas of Canterbury," was to be established, to attend to the general interests of the British Catholics. To effect the threefold object, the transference of the money, the dissolution of the Institute, and the formation of the Association, a public meeting of Catholics was called, to be held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand, on the 29th of November 1847. The meeting accordingly took place, under the presidency of that veteran soldier of the Church, the Right Rev. William Morris, Bishop of Troy. The first resolution was proposed by Mr. Langdale and seconded by Frederick Lucas, the junction of those two names as proposer and seconder being, as we shall see, significant. This first resolution should be given to the reader in full. It was as follows:

Resolved, that it being found desirable to dissolve the Catholic Institute, with a view to carry out its purposes more efficiently by other and more appropriate arrangements, the members of the Institute present at this meeting hereby declare the Institute dissolved, and authorise the trustees to pay over to the Education Committee recently appointed by the Catholic Bishops of England and Wales so much of the funds as on the books of the Catholic Institute stand to the account of the Education Department, and to the Association of St. Thomas of Canterbury so much of the funds and property as are appropriated to general purposes.

Other resolutions expressed the satisfaction of the meeting at the action of the bishops, and at the formation of the Association of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Advantage was also taken of the meeting to return grateful thanks to Mr.

Langdale for his "labours and exertions in behalf of Catholic rights and the interests of the Catholic poor through the whole course of his public life, both in Parliament and out of it, and particularly in his connection with the Catholic Institute since its reorganisation in 1845."

A report had been in circulation amongst some Catholics, belonging to that class of persons who, being ignorant of the real state of things, invent or exaggerate facts for the sake of talking scandal, that the Association of St. Thomas of Canterbury had been got up in opposition to Mr. Langdale. That such was not the case the reader will have learned in the account of the origin of the Association, in the article on "The Hon. Charles Langdale" in the July number of the DUBLIN REVIEW. Mr. Langdale became a member of the Association, and subscribed to its funds during its short existence, and the junction of his name with that of Mr. Lucas as proposer and seconder of the first resolution shows that the two men, so far from being in opposition, were in perfect accordance. But the appearance of the two men working together in the Catholic cause was also a sign that Mr. Langdale did not resent, as many a man would have done, the very fierce attacks which the editor of the *Tablet* had, only a few months previously, made upon him when he refused to call a public meeting of Catholics. And this gives occasion to mention two noble traits in Mr. Langdale's character. There can be no doubt that Lucas exceeded to a great extent the bounds of moderation in his invective on the occasion above referred to. Many, perhaps all, of those who agreed with Lucas and opposed Mr. Langdale on the question of calling the meeting, highly disapproved of and intensely regretted the offensive observations of the editor. It is not necessary to reproduce here what any one who wishes to search into the past may find in the files of the *Tablet*. It is sufficient to say that Mr. Langdale must have very keenly felt the harsh tone of the articles. His daughter Mary, whose "Recollections" have been several times quoted, says :

We used often to dislike the tone of a certain Catholic paper; and on several occasions when papa had written or spoken publicly, and had not taken the somewhat *ultra* views of the editor, which annoyed him [the editor] much, he expressed his opinion and feelings about papa in no

very moderate terms in print, so much so that on more than one occasion both priests and a bishop inserted in the paper their strong disapproval of his attacks on papa. We used to be present when papa opened the paper, and he used to read these attacks on himself, at which we used to be very indignant; but we never could get him to express the least soreness or annoyance. On the contrary, he generally turned it into a joke, and said the editor had a perfect right to say what he pleased about him. Still, it was impossible he should not on several occasions have felt very keenly the cutting sarcasms he found addressed to or about himself. It was, however, very different [adds Miss Langdale] when he found others attacked and, he considered, unjustly blamed; all his indignation was at once roused. On one occasion, a young leading Catholic nobleman, the late Duke of Norfolk, came forward, almost for the first time, in some Catholic cause. He had previously consulted papa, who had encouraged and approved of the moderate view he took; and knowing also that it was a great effort for him to come forward at all in public. The young nobleman's conduct on this occasion was highly disapproved by the same editor, who wished him to have expressed himself in much stronger language. His paper contained a most virulent attack on his first *début*, and he expressed most discouraging and gloomy forebodings for his future religious opinions. When papa read this, foreseeing at once all the bad effect it was likely to produce, all the fire of his indignation was aroused, and in the next week's paper he wrote a letter of approbation of the young gentleman's conduct, and of high disapproval of the editor's remarks. He was always earnest [Miss Langdale concludes] in trying to induce young Catholic gentlemen to take their share and an interest in the affairs of religion, and, if possible, bring them forward at any public meeting. Their backwardness and shyness at such times was a great distress to him.

The simple earnestness of the daughter in showing the humility and the chivalry of her father leaves a much more pleasing and durable impression upon the reader than would a more laboured and more minute account of the facts to which she alludes.

Before the public meeting at the Crown and Anchor, on the 29th November 1847, had been held, the first meeting of the Poor School Committee took place, on the 10th and 11th of the same month. It met at the residence of Mr. Nasmyth Stokes, No. 18 Nottingham Street, Marylebone, at which house the committee had its office and meeting room. Mr. Stokes had been appointed secretary. I believe he was appointed by the bishops, but as the first minute-book of the committee has been lost, the fact cannot be stated for certain.

As the articles in this Review on Charles Langdale are a

memoir of Mr. Langdale, and not a history of the Poor School Committee, it will not be necessary to enter further into the details of what the committee did, than to show the character, the influence and the work of the chairman. Of all the members of the committee, Mr. Langdale was the only one who professed to make the work of education through the committee the one great object of his life. Though all the members of the committee showed a zeal in the work which was worthy of the cause, and though those few who habitually resided in London were liable to be summoned to sub-committee meetings, and had more to do than those who lived the greater part of the year in the country, yet Mr. Langdale was the permanent watchman. He made himself acquainted with everything, whether done or proposed to be done by the Government, or attempted by various politicians and religious bodies, which could in any way affect the education of Catholic children. He was not content with knowing and attending to the present wants of the Catholic schools, he looked forward to the future; and I believe I am right in saying that he was the first to bring before the committee, and through the committee before the public, the necessity of immediate Catholic action in the matter of training colleges, of reformatory schools, and industrial schools. The first work which the chairman and the committee had to attend to was the distribution of the money collected and subscribed for the building and supporting of schools. The Vicars Apostolic in a joint pastoral ordered a yearly collection for the committee in all churches and chapels, and private subscriptions considerably increased. In the first year the income of the committee was £4000. In everything connected with grants of money the chairman acted with the greatest fairness and impartiality. He, however, always showed a reluctance to make a grant where he thought there were persons in the congregation from which the application was made who were able to support the school. He decidedly discouraged all applications under such circumstances, unless, indeed, it was clear that the priest of the place was unable to move the hearts of those who could but would not assist him.

But the most important work which fell to the lot of the chairman in the early days of the committee was the settling

with the Government the terms on which Catholics were to receive grants for schools. The whole question had to come before the committee ; but the committee could not take a step in an important matter of this kind without the authority of the Bishops. Both the Government and the Vicars Apostolic were inclined to make concessions to a certain extent. But both the Government and the Vicars were determined to stand by certain principles, the firm maintenance of which at one time brought the negotiations between the Poor School Committee and the Committee of Council on Education to a deadlock. The situation was such that a proposition was made on the committee that we should throw up the connection with the Government altogether. This motion was, however, defeated by a large majority. But the difficulty was at last overcome, as we shall presently see. All the most important part of the correspondence with the Government in this serious question fell upon Mr. Langdale. His letters are models for any Catholic who wishes in communications with Government to be conciliatory, and at the same time firm, to insist, in order to insure equality of treatment, upon a recognition of the discipline of the Catholic Church, where such recognition does not interfere with the rights of others.

Our difference with the Government arose out of what was called the "Management Clause" of the deed vesting the school property in trustees for school purposes *in perpetuum*, and which the Committee of Council on Education required to be executed whenever it gave money on a building grant. The matter is of no practical consequence now, except to those schools which received Government building grants previous to the Education Act of 1870. But a short notice of the question is necessary in a Life of Charles Langdale, as it shows his own excellence as a Catholic negotiator ; and as it proves what a layman can effect when in a question affecting religion, taking his stand on the decisions of his ecclesiastical superiors on the one hand, and on his rights as a British subject on the other hand, he perseveringly fights for justice. The management clause of the deed was so framed that while it gave to the priest of the congregation to which the school belonged "the management and superintendence of the religious instruction of all the scholars attending the said school," it left a

power in any lay member of the committee to make what objection he pleased to the instruction given. After many months of correspondence this anomaly in the discipline of the Catholic Church was got rid of, by the Government consenting to withdraw that part of the clause which gave a lay member of the committee a right to interfere. Other alterations were made in the school trust deed, which put the relations between Catholic schools and the Government in a state which, if not perfectly satisfactory, was, at any rate, such as could be accepted. In the whole of the controversy on the management clause and other parts of the trust deed, Mr. Langdale was carrying out the decisions and the wishes of the Vicars Apostolic, and had the authority of the Poor School Committee for all he did; but he is entitled to the praise of having conducted the negotiations to a successful issue. To show how careful the chairman and the committee were not to encroach on the jurisdiction of the bishops, it may be stated that at one meeting of the committee, when a decision on an *ultimatum* to be sent to the Government had to be come to before the evening, the bishops being in town for their Low Week meeting, Mr. Langdale adjourned the meeting twice in order to send a deputation to their lordships to have their directions on some point in question, the second deputation having to go to Clapham to meet the bishops. In the working of the Poor School Committee, while constant reference was made to the bishops, either by the whole committee, or by a small acting committee, or by the chairman alone, certainly no one in those days ever thought of complaining that the bishops did not leave the committee enough liberty and enough to do. In the Poor School Committee and its relations with the bishops, we had, perhaps, as perfect an example as could be shown anywhere of harmonious working together of clergy and laity in a matter affecting the Catholic religion. That the result of a correspondence with the Government was a substantial gain was acknowledged by members of the Established Church, one of whom (unless my memory is at fault, it was Archdeacon Denison) wrote to Mr. Stokes to ask him how it was that the Roman Catholics had obtained such favourable terms. Mr. Stokes told me that his answer was that Catholics had obtained what they wanted, because they were united, and there was no

difference amongst them as to what was wanted.* Having mentioned the name of Mr. Stokes, it is by no means out of place in a notice of Mr. Langdale to record the very great help and assistance it was to him to be aided by one who was not only a very able secretary, but one who himself took great personal interest in the work of the committee.

I will quote here one sentence from Mr. Langdale's correspondence with the Government which shows the thorough Christian principles on which he acted :

The Catholic Poor School Committee equally regret with the Lord President their difference with his lordship. They have every wish to adopt any suggestion short of a violation of the religion to which they have already sacrificed benefits conferred upon other classes of their fellow-subjects. They most deeply deplore any decision of the Lord President which will again condemn the schools of their poor children to struggle on under difficulties from which others are relieved out of funds raised equally at their expense; but if this primary aid is to be purchased only at the sacrifice of principle, they must indeed protest against the injustice; but they cannot hesitate to preserve to their poorest brethren, as to themselves, the inheritance inviolate of the Roman Catholic faith.

This may be a proper place to notice the relations which subsisted between Mr. Langdale and that illustrious churchman, Cardinal Wiseman, whose memory will ever be blessed amongst English Catholics. When the Poor School Committee was formed, Bishop Wiseman was Pro-Vicar Apostolic of the London District. He then, in July 1848, became coadjutor to Bishop Walsh in London, and on the death of Bishop Walsh, early in 1849, his coadjutor succeeded him as Vicar Apostolic of the London District, and remained so until he was created Archbishop of Westminster and Cardinal in September 1850. Cardinal Wiseman died in 1865, and Mr. Langdale in 1868, so that for eighteen years, and until three years of Mr. Langdale's death, Cardinal Wiseman was exercising ecclesiastical authority, and with the exception of about seven months sole authority in the Metropolis. As all the important business of the Poor School Committee was carried

* The union which Mr. Stokes here speaks of was simply the agreement amongst the members of the Poor School Committee to carry out the wishes of the bishops in a matter relating to education. He did not mean that Catholics were generally united in questions on which they were at liberty to differ. On this we shall have Mr. Langdale's opinion later.

on in London, Cardinal Wiseman was the authority to whom Mr. Langdale had most frequent recourse; other Catholic matters also sometimes brought the two together. What struck me as most remarkable in their intercourse was the extreme respect which they both showed for each other, and the mutual confidence which existed between them. It was plainly to be seen that the Cardinal placed the firmest trust in Mr. Langdale, not merely that he would not overstep the sphere of a layman's work, but that in all he undertook he would act with prudence and vigour. The Cardinal seemed always most anxious to meet the views of Mr. Langdale, and it is no small praise to say of a man of independent spirit, and to whom great liberty of action was allowed, that during thirty years, when he was engaged in most important Catholic affairs, he never came into collision with his ecclesiastical superiors. Any layman who has taken an active interest in the welfare of the Church in England, or who has wished to do so in a layman's sphere, can well appreciate the qualities which enabled Mr. Langdale to work so well as he did for so long a time.

In the work which the committee had to do, not the least important, and perhaps the most important, was the forming of training colleges for both male and female teachers. Where so many persons, including bishops, priests and Poor School Committee were responsible in their different spheres for the education of the poor, and were actively engaged in devising means for carrying on the important work, it is difficult to apportion with certainty the credit of being the originators of successful schemes to any persons in particular. But the writer of this article can say that while he was a member of the committee in its early days, not only was Mr. Langdale the first from whom he heard of training colleges and industrial schools, and perhaps also reformatory, but Mr. Langdale was certainly the one upon whom fell almost all of the work which was necessary to commence those institutions as connected with the Catholic Church. The whole question relating to those establishments was, of course, discussed on the committee, and the committee had the benefit of the advice and of knowing the wishes of the bishops; but Mr. Langdale was most certainly what may be called the executive

power in the committee. He, with the help of Mr. Stokes, had to carry out what the committee decided upon ; and the committee always left Mr. Langdale a considerable margin within which he was to decide for himself what to do, and to act upon his own decision.

As this notice of Mr. Langdale has advanced beyond the year 1848, it may be well to recur to that year to mention his conduct with regard to the "Diplomatic Relations Act." It was "An Act for enabling Her Majesty to establish and maintain Diplomatic Relations with the Sovereign of the Roman States." Probably now the Holy Father would be mentioned in an Act of Parliament as "His Holiness the Pope," as there are symptoms in these days that Englishmen would act as gentlemen in their relations with the Head of the "greatest power on earth, the most ancient dynasty in history." * The Act contained a clause which Lord Eglinton carried against the Government, providing that no person should be received as ambassador from the Court of Rome "who should be in Holy Orders, or a Jesuit or member of any other religious Order, Community or Society of the Church of Rome, bound by religious vows." This clause prevented the Holy Father not only from availing himself of the Act, but from condescending to take any notice of it. While the Bill was before Parliament, the Association of St. Thomas of Canterbury held a meeting to petition against it, and to address the Holy Father in a sense adverse to the Bill. Mr. Langdale was invited to preside at the meeting. He wrote his answer to the writer of this article ; and as it shows his mind not only with regard to the Diplomatic Relations Bill, but to other matters, it is worthy of insertion. It was written from "Houghton" and was as follows :

I must decline the honour you propose, however opposed I may be to the Diplomatic Relations Bill, especially with the insulting exception to his proposed Ambassador to this country. From your account the chairman will have a somewhat difficult task to keep peace in the meeting ; and I have great doubts as to the propriety of calling Catholics together when you foresee that it will be an occasion of dissension (a

* *Vide* Cardinal Newman's "Lectures on the Present Condition of Catholics in England," lecture v. p. 194, 4th edition, where his Eminence speaks about this Act.

positive evil), without any very sure good arising even from success. Will it ever be possible to get Catholics in *England* to think alike on any one subject? I believe not. They seem to consider any question as one of the Articles of Faith; so to be died for rather than yielded. I shall be in town on Monday morning ready for a preliminary meeting [this must have been of the Poor School Committee], which I suppose will be held at two o'clock, at 18 Nottingham Street. Lucas seems to have misunderstood a hurried note I wrote him from York on Friday. Our Yorkshire meeting is in support of education.

Yours very truly, CHARLES LANGDALE.

Your great guns of St. Thomas of Canterbury have broken up rather sooner than I anticipated.

There was some cause for Mr. Langdale's fears for the peace of the meeting, and also for his remark about the "great guns of St. Thomas of Canterbury." As there was a rather strong minority on the committee against holding the public meeting above referred to, and as many of the members of the minority withdrew altogether from the Association, it was thought there would probably be some amendments proposed at the meeting, in which case there would have been an uproar. Almost all the members of the Association who were able to supply the pecuniary means of carrying on business, including amongst others Earl John of Shrewsbury, resigned membership. These were the "great guns" Mr. Langdale speaks of. But if the great guns charged with gold were not present nor represented at the meeting, several great guns charged with intellect—Mr. Lucas, Mr. G. W. Ward, and the Rev. Mr. Oakeley—were present, and delivered strong speeches against the "Diplomatic Relations Bill."

Mr. Langdale's observation about the "great guns" affords an opportunity for mentioning a very decided trait in his character. This was his fondness for rallying his friends on any subjects relating to them which happened to amuse him. It was always, of course, in good humour, and with evident satisfaction to himself, without wounding the feelings of others. An early member of the Poor School Committee was the Rev. John Walker, afterwards Canon Walker, of Scarborough, a great friend of Mr. Langdale's. There must be many still alive who remember him and his extraordinary love for argument. On one occasion, during the adjournment of the committee for lunch, when several remained in the committee-

room, Mr. Langdale asked Mr. Walker if a story he had heard was true—that when going a journey by railway he was accustomed to walk up and down the platform to notice the man who should get into the train, and who he thought would make a good disputant; then, if possible, to take his seat opposite to him, get into conversation, contradict the first assertion he made, and so have an argument. Mr. Walker admitted the impeachment, saying that in that way he had often passed the time very pleasantly between York and London.

Another letter of Mr. Langdale's, written in the year 1848, cannot fail to be interesting to those who care to know his opinions on the state of affairs in Ireland in that year. It is only necessary, before quoting the letter, to remind the reader of the unfortunate and abortive attempt at a rising against the British Government, which was headed by Smith O'Brien and his young friend, Thomas Francis Meagher. Just previous to the rising, some treasonable and shameful articles had been published in one especially of the Irish newspapers, instructing civilians how to fight against the military, particularly in towns, where vitriol and other murderous things could be thrown out of the windows upon the soldiers. At the trial of the insurgents, towards the end of the year 1848, the Government also resorted to a shameful practice of another description—namely, that of excluding Catholics from the jury, in order to ensure a conviction. It was proposed to hold a meeting in London to protest against the unjust and cruel conduct of the Government. That was the sole motive for holding the meeting. There was not, of course, the smallest intention of in any way approving of the acts for which the insurgents were to be tried. Mr. Langdale was asked to attend the meeting, and probably he was asked to preside. The following letter, written from Houghton on the 6th of December 1848, was his answer to the application. This letter also was addressed to the writer of this article.

I can make no comparison between the present position of Ireland and its leaders and the now all but denounced O'Connell. Though I never was a Repealer, the *moral* agitation of that question I ever considered constitutional, and consistent with religion. The Government of that

day,* in spite of every declaration to the contrary, would *construe* a conspiracy out of legal and constitutional acts. But now treason is not the implied but openly avowed object of its leaders, and, as far as advice and suggestion could accomplish it, carried by modes the most atrocious that human ingenuity could invent (vitriol, &c. &c.). Now, I could be no party to any of those late proceedings without avowing myself a traitor and a perjuror, and though I am quite ready to acknowledge that a traitor has a full right to a fair trial and an impartial jury, I could not attend a meeting of the description to which you allude without denouncing the treason, whilst I claimed a fair trial for the traitor. But I lament to say that even this is not all. Opinions have been put forth on the duties of jurymen in Ireland, and an interpretation put upon their oaths, which in my opinion strike at the very existence of trial by jury. I ask again: how could I take part in the proposed meeting without separating myself from such interpretations? Now observe, I do not by the above wish to put a construction upon the motives of others; but I am bound to act upon my own conscientious views and opinions, and to take care that others do not mistake them. I say, then, that if I took a part in a public meeting, I should be bound in honour, honesty, and conscience to see that I was not involved, nor likely to involve others, in what my judgment would tell me was a violation of the laws of God and man.

I need hardly say that the profession of these sentiments, though quite consistent with the denunciation of striking off a Catholic, *as a Catholic*, from a jury, could only create confusion and dissension, without any practical good. Now, one word more, though not quite requisite for the purport of this letter. My opinion of striking off Catholic jurymen, even though their actual participation in the imputed crime of a prisoner was clear and manifest, is so likely to prove injurious to the welfare of Ireland, that infinitely better would it have been to have suspended trial by jury than thus raise the presumption that it was religion and not impartiality that was sought for as the qualification of an Irish jurymen. Lamentable has been and is the fate of Ireland. The misgovernment of centuries is working out its evil consequences both to the oppressor and oppressed, and that once-favoured class for which so much injustice has been perpetrated seems destined to expiate in their own persons and property the guilt of which they were the primary cause.

Believe me, yours truly, CHARLES LANGDALE.

There are several things worthy of notice in this letter, as showing the mind and character of Mr. Langdale. In the first place we have his decided opinion that O'Connell's agitation in 1843 was constitutional and conscientious. The

* Mr. Langdale here alludes to the prosecution of O'Connell and others by Sir Robert Peel at the beginning of the year 1844.

conviction that it was constitutional he shared with the whole of the Whig party. But Mr. Langdale did not condemn Sir Robert Peel's prosecution of O'Connell simply because he was a Whig. His denunciation of the proceedings of Smith O'Brien show with sufficient clearness that his political views were mastered by his conscience. He conscientiously believed that O'Connell did nothing contrary to law in his campaign of monster meetings.

The party which Mr. Langdale had always supported was in power in 1848, but that did not prevent him from seeing and acknowledging that even that party was pursuing the fatal course of governing the Catholic, Irish, or English Protestant principles. It may be emphatically said of him that, though attached to a party, he was a Catholic first and a Whig afterwards. In this respect he was a brilliant example to all those English Catholics who have attached themselves to a political party.

The last portion of the letter is almost prophetic: what Mr. Langdale feared, and, indeed, foresaw, is forced upon us now in stern reality.

The letter also shows the extreme delicacy of Mr. Langdale's loyalty, and of his sense of the obligation of showing it. It is impossible not to admire that enthusiastic state of mind which would not allow him to denounce injustice in the conduct of the trial without delivering a philippic against the crimes of which the defendants were accused. No one would for a moment have supposed that Mr. Langdale approved of rebellion. This letter of Mr. Langdale's shows very clearly the difference between him and some others of the English Catholics as to the tone which should be adopted in dealing with unfair treatment by the governing authorities. Men who had as loyal hearts as Mr. Langdale, and who disapproved as much as he did of the foolish attempt at rebellion, thought their first duty was to protest against the unfairness of the trial, and then leave to circumstances which might arise at the meeting the necessity of denouncing the actions of the accused. If a man were to be convicted of murder in England by a packed jury, no one would say that his counsel in complaining of the injustice was obliged, in order to preserve his

reputation, to deliver an invective against murder and murderers. The same should be said of what might happen in Ireland. Smith O'Brien and his friends were entitled to as much consideration in their political offence as would be given to a common felon in England. But those who thought with Mr. Langdale, and those who differed with him in this matter, were all loyal and honourable men.

WILLIAM J. AMHERST, S.J.

ART. VII.—THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM.

1. *La question Religieuse en Orient et l'Union des Églises.*
Par un MISSIONNAIRE. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre,
Rue Bonaparte, 90. 1893.
2. *Discours d'Ourverture et de Clôture.* Prononcés par S.E. LE CARDINAL LANGÉNIEUX, Archévêque de Reims, Légat du Saint Siège, aux solemnités Eucharistiques de Jerusalem, 15-21 Mai. 1893.

THE great Eucharistic Congress at Jerusalem is over. Its success has been undoubted, and is acknowledged by all. Jerusalem is not only the Holy City of the chosen people of God, the site of the Temple, the centre of Divine Worship, and of the ancient prophecies and sacrifices; it is also the birth-place and cradle of the Blessed Sacrament—the spot where was enacted man's redemption on the Cross of Calvary. In the words of Cardinal Langénieux: “It has furnished the newly-born Church with all the essential elements to affirm its constitution and assure its development. To the East we owe our first pastors, our Liturgy, our Apostles, our first institutions, the first body of the faithful. It is the real birth-place of the Apostolate, and the whole world has thrilled at its preaching, *in omnem terram exivit sonus eorum.*”

If, therefore, the Holy See has willed to be represented at this Eucharistic Congress, which it had never done before, it was because it gave the Sovereign Pontiff an opportunity to show his sympathy with and admiration for these Oriental churches, the first-born of the Church of God—churches which, in spite of errors and divergences on certain points, had always kept the dogma of the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharistic Sacrifice from the earliest times until now.

“How dear to us,” exclaimed Leo XIII. to Cardinal Langénieux, “are those churches of the East! How we admire their ancient glories, and how great would be our joy and happiness if we could see them once more united to us in Faith, Hope, and Charity!”

This Congress, then, has had two results: first, we will hope, an increase of love, fervour and devotion towards our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament; and, secondly, a strong and sensible movement towards the union of the separated churches, which is ably discussed in the book we are about to review.

The author begins by describing the first schism in the fifth century, when Nestorius established his heresy in the East of Syria, and fixed upon Seleucia as his Episcopal See. This century was to witness another schism; for the Armenians who had refused to join Nestorius, would not accept the Council of Chalcedon. Three heresies then started up: the Syrian-Jacobite, the Armenian, and the Coptic, who carried their revolt into Abyssinia.

Those who remained faithful to the Holy See received the name of *Melchites*; while another body, in the mountains of the Lebanon, called themselves *Maronites*, and have always continued fervent Catholics.

The rupture between the East and West, begun at Constantinople by the ambition of Photius, and finally completed by Michael Cerularius, continued till the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries with no attempt at reunion. But, then, a large number of Nestorians (under the name of Chaldeans) and a respectable body of Syrians, Greeks, Copts, and Armenians rejoined the Church of Rome, while reserving their own rites and discipline, and having each their own Patriarch, in union with the Holy See, together with a large number of Bishops and Archbishops. According to statistics, the numbers thus united amount to upwards of 2,000,000. The most ancient of all the schismatic bodies, the Nestorians, form a community of 200,000 souls, residing principally in Kurdistan. They are on the point of joining the Church of Rome, and are schismatic only in name. The Syrian-Jacobites also have drawn up a profession of faith to be shown to the Holy Father, which, if approved of, will, we hope, lead to a similar consummation. Still more important is the movement among the Copts towards this union since the meeting of the Eucharistic Congress. The Patriarch of Cairo had a long interview with the Cardinal Legate, and seems most desirous of coming to an understanding with the Holy See.

The Greeks are the most numerous of the separated

Churches, and are all nominally under the Patriarch of Constantinople. But, in reality, he has no power save in Turkey and in Asia Minor.

After this rapid summary of the state of the various Oriental Churches, our author goes on to prove the impossibility of a continuance of this state of things. He quotes the opinion of M. de Maistre on the evils which threatened the Eastern Churches even in his time, and which now are multiplied a thousandfold. He writes :

All the Churches separated from the Holy See since the beginning of the twelfth century may be compared to frozen bodies, of which the forms could only have been preserved by the cold. This cold is the ignorance which was to last longer with them than with us, for it has pleased God to concentrate for a time all human science in the West.

But as soon as the hot wind of science shall blow on these Churches, the laws of nature will be carried out ; old forms will be dissolved and nothing but dust will remain. This is an assured fact : *That no religion, save one, can bear the test of science.* This oracle is more sure than that of Chalcas. Science is a species of acid which dissolves all metals *except gold.**

Further on he adds :

Our languages and our sciences will penetrate into these Churches, and we shall see them go through all those phases of dissolution and disruption which Calvinist and Lutheran Protestantism have already unrolled before our eyes. In all these Churches the great changes I speak of will begin with the clergy, and the first to give us this interesting spectacle will be the Russian Church, for she is the most exposed to the winds from Europe.

In the face of these serious warnings, let us look at what is now happening in the East. We must bear in mind, in the first place, that distances have, in one sense, ceased to exist ; that a continual movement brings different races together, so that relations which formerly seemed impossible are now become perfectly easy and feasible. The result is that the East cannot remain in its former isolation, and its children welcome with ardour all who bring them education and science and the means to place themselves on the same intellectual footing as the West. The consequence is that schools and colleges may now be reckoned by thousands where forty or fifty years ago such a thing as a place of education was unknown. It never,

* Joseph de Maistre. "Du Pape." Book iv. chap. ii.

probably, occurred to an Oriental that his children, while acquiring learning would lose their old faith, yet there is no doubt that, in a multitude of instances, this has been the case. As for Catholics, their plain duty is to put themselves at the head of a movement which they cannot stop ; and prevent the rising generation from being swallowed up by a wave of infidelity, heresy, and free-thought. But the usual difficulty—want of means—arrests their progress on every side. The progress of modern ideas is equally remarkable if we look at the separated Churches. In Russia, for instance, in spite of the most rigorous measures, the official Church is threatened with dissolution. A work recently published in France by a Russian, M. Tsakni, gives us a list of fifteen of these sects who have abandoned the Orthodox Church, and he reckons the number of their adherents at *fifteen millions*.* M. Solovieff and M. Léroy Beaulieu confirm this statement.

What is true of the Russian Church is equally so in Greece. The Protestant Universities of Germany train the greater number of their Greek priests ; and M. Lionel Radiguet states, in a Review, published in December 1890, that, in consequence, “The most dangerous elements of Protestantism have been introduced into the minds of the clergy, and in many cases Christianity itself has well nigh evaporated.”

The *Acropolis*, of the 21st of March 1889, publishes the following statement :

The Professor of Theology, in a lecture yesterday, delivered at Parnassus, declared that in the researches he had made in the earliest centuries of Christianity, there were no church rites. They gave alms, did good works, were ready to die for their faith and their country ; but they had neither churches, nor offices, nor feasts, nor fasts ! He even had failed to find any distinct idea of the Sacraments !

The evil is equally wide-spread in Servia, Bulgaria, and Roumania. The Exarch of Bulgaria, Mgr. Joseph, in a discourse pronounced by him at Constantinople, on the Feast of St. Methodius, exclaimed : “The mass of our people have become cold and indifferent. As to the educated classes, they are decidedly hostile to all that is holy, and it is only the fear of Russia which prevents their abolishing the Bulgarian Church

* “La Russie Sectaire.” Paris : Librairie Plon.

altogether." There again we see that the "acid" of M. de Maistre has penetrated, as in all the separated branches of the Oriental Church, and is accomplishing its work of decomposition. The idea of an *Œcumical Council* has been suggested by many of the more earnest members of these Churches, as a way of remedying such ever-growing evils. But without union, without a centre, and without any paramount authority to enable its decisions to be accepted or respected, how is such a Council possible?

Our author devotes the next chapter of his book to the rapid strides made by the Protestant sects in Egypt, Palestine and Syria, thanks to the innumerable number of schools and colleges opened and maintained by them in every direction. In Egypt, the Americans began this sort of propaganda, especially among the Copts, and in 1890 their schools were frequented by upwards of 4000 boys and 2000 girls. A decree having been passed rendering the English language obligatory for candidates for places in the different Government Departments, a great impulse has, naturally, been given to those schools where that language is taught, and these are necessarily either English or American. But the English have gone further; at least, the High Church or Ritualist portion of the Anglican Establishment. They have translated a Coptic Catechism into English, with a carefully written introduction by the Rev. Raikes Bromage, breathing throughout the most earnest desire for the reunion of the separated Eastern Churches with the Anglican Communion. His object is clearly expressed in the following passage:

"We Anglicans have simply to strengthen the hands of the Orthodox Eastern Church, and endeavour to break down the barriers which have hitherto prevented reconciliation."

This clergyman was furnished with letters from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Patriarch of Alexandria, who received him with the greatest kindness, and in his reply spoke of "affording him moral concurrence for the fulfilling the scope of his sacred mission, and to contribute to the riveting of the happily-subsisting brotherly relations between the two Churches, that so the longed-for unity may be effected, and that, according to the promise of our Saviour Jesus Christ, there may be 'one flock and one shepherd.'"

This same Mr. Bromage visited the Coptic monasteries in the interior, and describes his reception by the Abbot of one of them with pontifical honours, after which he "celebrated the sacred mysteries according to the Anglican rite in the chief church, with the full approval of the Abbot, who was present himself with all his brethren."

We can well believe the mystified condition of this good Abbot, who had naturally no knowledge whatever of the real position of the Anglican Establishment, and had never studied its Thirty-nine Articles! Will no one have the charity to explain to the Patriarch, before he takes any further steps to consummate this wished-for union, that the Church of England has neither valid Orders nor valid Sacraments, and that in her formularies the Blessed Eucharist and the Holy Sacrifice, which form the key-stone of the faith of all the Oriental as of the Catholic Churches, are stigmatised as "idolatrous" and "dangerous deceits."

If we pass from Egypt to Palestine and Syria we find the same active Protestant propaganda, the same means of action, and the opening of innumerable schools, largely provided with all the requisites for a first-rate education. Mr. Lawrence Oliphant asserts that the "Church Missionary Society" alone had already spent upwards of 3,000,000 of francs towards this work in Palestine.

The Rev. R. P. Marzoyer, S.J., in his "Bulletin de l'œuvre des Ecoles d'Orient," speaks of no less than thirty different Protestant sects who have opened schools in Syria, and especially in Beyrouth. There is a large American University in that town, and normal schools for the training of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses. M. Pélegrin confirms these statements in his *Revue Française* of the 15th of September 1892, and mentions that in Asia Minor, the Americans have two large missions, one in Cilicia, with the University of Ain-Tab, on the borders of Syria, and another in Armenia, which was founded soon after the Crimean War.

In Mesopotamia, F. Ephrem, a Capuchin, writes: "The Protestants have built a magnificent College at Karpouth which is also a normal school for the teachers in the different villages; and in our great poverty we are quite unable to compete with them."

People say and think that Protestantism is too cold a religion to attract Orientals, who have too strong a love for their ancient traditions, and too tender a veneration for our Blessed Lady to be persuaded to abandon them. But these are feeble barriers to oppose to an influence which employs both money and science to entrap souls. The facts are indubitable. Protestant schools and colleges are daily multiplied, thousands and thousands of children frequent them, and have no other teaching ; and whether they will or no, these poor little things lose the faith of their baptism. Perhaps the whole of them may not become Protestants. Their fathers and mothers may keep some of them to their old creed, but inevitably doubts and confusion must arise in their minds as they grow older ; and we have ample evidence of the fact that children thus trained lose all faith and cease to be Christians, save in name.

And thus [continues our author] the Oriental Churches will not only lose their existence as religious communities, but their political autonomy, which is essentially linked with their religion, will disappear at the same time. We repeat what we have said before, and that with the most profound conviction, that the Churches of the East can only maintain their existence by uniting themselves to the Catholic Church, and this view is shared by all the thinking men amongst them.

There are, nominally, four obstacles to this reunion :

1. The liturgical question.
2. That of discipline.
3. That of dogma.
4. And, lastly, the political reasons.

The first two have already been completely disposed of by the Holy See.

In the Bull of Benedict XIV., *Ex quo Primum*, it is expressly laid down that, so far from wishing the Oriental Churches to give up their liturgies or alter their discipline, both are strictly enforced.

Again, in a second Bull published in 1755, *Allatae Sum*, the same Pope quotes a variety of decrees of his predecessors in the Papal chair in a similar sense, upwards of a dozen Pontiffs having ordered the strict preservation of all Oriental rites.

Pius IX. on the 6th of January 1848, repeats this injunction even more strongly. So far from wishing to alter anything in

the Oriental liturgies, the Popes have ever been their strenuous defenders. "It is not permissible," writes Benedict XIV. in his Bull *Demandatum*, "under any pretext whatever, for any individual, whether patriarch or bishop, to introduce any change or innovation in the Oriental rites."

And he adds in conclusion :

To bring back the Greeks and other separated Churches to the path of unity, it is not permitted that any change should be made in their rites. Therefore should any missioner desire to bring back an Oriental from schism to the Church of God, let him guard himself carefully from trying to make him embrace the Latin rite.

And he goes, beyond this, to threaten such a departure from his orders with deprival of faculties and other grave penalties. He goes even further by decreeing that :

If, on any occasion, from the absence of a priest of his (or her) particular rite, any person may have received the Sacraments from a Latin priest, he (or she) is not, therefore, to be considered as having embraced the Latin rite, but shall be held to preserve that rite in which he (or she) was born, &c.

We see, therefore, how unjust and untrue is the widely-spread belief or prejudice that *to join the Roman See, the Orientals must renounce their ancient liturgies*; and in the same explicit terms any change or innovation in their discipline has been equally strictly forbidden.

We come now to the question of dogma; but that, in reality, is only an imaginary difficulty. Our author on this head writes :

The Oriental Churches are separated to-day because they have been so for centuries, but without clinging to the disputed points which originally separated them from the centre of unity, and of which, in many cases, they are not even aware. Nor are they at all disposed to enter the lists on these points with any theologian whatever. . . . We must clearly understand that it is not on any doctrinal or dogmatic point that the division arose, but that *after* the separation began the discussions of doctrine.

He goes on to prove conclusively that Photius had no idea whatever, in the first instance, of separating from or criticising the Church of Rome; but that it was only when Rome refused the confirmation of his appointment as Patriarch of Constantinople that his revolt took place and the theological question was raised. He could not break with Rome without some apparent reason, and therefore resorted to this artifice. The proof of

this is, that when the Pope died who had opposed his nomination, he at once dropped the theological question and addressed letters to Rome expressing his entire concurrence with the doctrines of the Holy See, and begging the new Pope to confirm his election to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. When this was not granted and Photius was exiled, the new patriarch and his successor remained in communion with Rome till Michael Cerularius again raised a question of discipline and, furious at the disapproval of the Papal Legates, accomplished the separation.

But there is another point.

Never, since the separation of the Oriental Churches from Rome, has there been a council of the Oriental patriarchs and bishops to consider the theological questions at issue between them and the Latin Church. If, therefore, the Oriental prelates are questioned on any point, it is always to the ancient Councils that they refer, which proves that the real representatives of their doctrines are the Fathers who existed before the schism.

This being the case [continues our author], we are on ground where an understanding is easy and reunion possible. The true doctrine of the separated Churches is found in the writings of the early Fathers, in the *Œcumical Councils* of the first centuries, in their venerable liturgies and their historical monuments. . . . This is the ground on which we must take our stand when we treat of the union of the Churches—the common basis admitted by all, both Easterns and Westerns, and upon which a thorough understanding has already been arrived at. . . . Let us lay aside [he concludes] bitter criticisms, exaggerated statements, and unfounded assertions. Let us, on the contrary, bring forward the identity of belief, on the main points of Catholic dogma, remembering the words of St. Augustine: *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas*; and we shall help the great work of reunion far more effectually than by learned dissertations on such and such points, which are far more likely to divide men's minds than to draw them nearer to one another or unite them in the bonds of charity.

There remains, therefore, but the political question, which is, in fact, the only real difficulty.

When Constantine abandoned Rome as a capital and transferred the seat of his empire to Byzantium, it was on the ground,* “That he did not think it right or just that where

* From the words of the “Donation of Constantine,” preserved by the Greeks among their Canonical Laws.

the Supreme Priesthood had been Divinely instituted there should likewise be the supreme terrestrial authority."

It would not be possible to indicate more clearly the separation of the two powers. But the successors of the great Emperor did not view things in the same light, and, after a time, the Emperors of Byzantium became jealous of the supremacy of the spiritual power. They wished to have authority over both Church and State, and to attain to this end they succeeded in making a Pope of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

This, in a few words, is the history of the Greek schism.

But the principle of the subordination of the Church to the State reacted upon its authors. It was only possible, in fact, as long as the unity of the Roman Empire existed. When that Empire was broken up and Constantinople ceased to be its capital, she lost, bit by bit, the authority thus unjustly assumed. The foundation of the Patriarchate of Moscow virtually deprived her of the new Empire of Russia. "Your Patriarch is myself," exclaimed Peter the Great, and the Czars have ever since retained that power.

When Greece recovered her independence and established a kingdom, the same thing occurred ; and so on with Servia and Bulgaria.

These facts [writes our author] prove the falsehood of the principle ; for Jesus Christ did not found a series of state or national churches, independent of each other, but one Church only, under the spiritual authority of one Head, and that Head not opposed to the temporal authority, but distinct from it and destined to co-operate with it for the benefit of nations and of society. . . . Let the Churches of the East recognise these facts and learn the lesson taught them by their own history. Let them abandon the false principle which has caused their fall, and they will come back to their old strength, to their ancient splendour, and to the fecundity which has ceased since their separation. Otherwise, they will lose, bit by bit, their Christian spirit and hierarchical authority, and the Oriental Churches will cease to exist. Instead of being a support to the State, they will involve it in the like ruin ; so that politicians will be forced to recognise that it is only by union with the one Church that they can preserve their own power. For this Church alone has maintained her authority and independence, and only uses her powerful influence in the world to recommend and impose respect and submission to temporal authority. . . .

Statesmen of all shades of opinion begin to understand this. The Russian papers even begin to write in the same sense. In the *Noroie*

Vremia of the 14th of November it is said : "The Pope is our natural ally. Therefore Russia should prevent everything which might contribute to diminish the *prestige* of the Holy See, or weaken the power of the Pope. Without sacrificing our own interests as an orthodox Power and as a sovereign State, yet having numberless Catholic subjects, like the Poles, we can and we ought to grant large and wise concessions, to have the greatest regard for the Pope as the head of the Catholic Church, and formally to respect his rights as a temporal sovereign. This, in a word, should be the direction of our policy."

Even more recently, the Procurator of the Holy Synod, in a letter to Cardinal Rampolla, speaks of "Union, as the sole efficacious means of resisting the flood of impiety and Socialism which is overflowing the Christian world."

M. Tricoupis, in Greece, upholds with all his strength and influence the idea of union, and is propagating it in the national press, which is devoted to him.

The truth is, that not only statesmen, but all thinking men, are becoming seriously alarmed at the terrible growth of socialist, atheist, and revolutionary principles among the different nations of the earth—principles which threaten the destruction of all order and authority ; and they feel that the only power which can permanently resist these dangers is that of the Holy See.

For this union, then, let all unite in earnest prayer, according to the words of our Lord Himself to His Heavenly Father : *Ut sint unum ; ut sint consummati in unum*—a union desired by the East as by the West, and which is as needful for the temporal as for the spiritual welfare of the Oriental Churches.

In the closing words of Cardinal Langenieux's magnificent speech, we read as follows :

The Church can be no more divided than can the Body of Christ. In contrast to the ancient synagogue, which was essentially national, she cannot be circumscribed within the limits of a province or a nation ; and as two words have personified hitherto the East and the West, we declare she is not Greek, she is not Latin ; she is *Catholic*, as universal as the Divine Paternity and the Redemption of Christ. But she conforms herself admirably to the temperament of the different countries and people whom she gathers within her bosom. Like the apostle, she makes herself all things to all men, that she may save all : *Omnibus omnia factus sum, ut omnes facerem salvos.*

May all Christians who have at heart the souls of their brethren, the glory of their Divine Master, and the extension of

His reign upon earth, unite their prayers with this holy prelate to hasten the hour marked out by Providence, when the East and the West shall embrace one another in the bonds of charity, so that a complete union may be effected and the prayer of our Divine Master be fulfilled—"That there may be one fold and one Shepherd."

MARY ELIZABETH HERBERT.

ART. VIII. — RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN ENGLAND DURING THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES.

THE history of the pre-Reformation Church in England has yet to be written. To many this may perhaps seem a somewhat bold statement in view of all that has hitherto appeared in print bearing on the ecclesiastical history of this country. Let me explain my precise meaning. For the most part, until quite recent times, the story of this England of ours has been made to consist mainly of a series of biographies of its rulers, intermingled with more or less detailed accounts of the wars and battles by which they mounted to power or rendered their names illustrious. Of the nation itself, as apart from the monarch who honoured it by ruling over it, the historian in the past troubled his readers as little as possible; and thus, whilst he might learn to know the dates of many battles and the genealogies of many royal houses, the inquirer remained practically ignorant of the English people. In a similar spirit Church annalists have not thought it their duty to record much beyond the doings of illustrious English Churchmen and the most conspicuous results which have flowed from their actions and their ecclesiastical policy generally.

Now, however, we are anxious to learn something more about the people who compose the nation, of the conditions under which they lived and acted, of their desires and aspirations, and of their struggles against difficulties external and internal. And in the same way the thoughts of all inquirers are turning more and more to a consideration of the religious side of our national life, an inquiry which promises to enlighten us at last as to the real history of the religion of the English people in the later Middle Ages and the century of the Reformation. What, for example, did our forefathers definitely believe? How were they affected by the religious system under which they lived? How were the services carried on in the churches, and what were the popular devotions of the time? Were the religious offices well frequented, and what

was the general character of the behaviour of the people whilst present at them? How did the priests instruct their flocks, and what profit did they seemingly derive from their ministrations? What did the church do for the great cause of education, and for the social and material welfare of the people at large? These and a hundred kindred questions are daily being proposed, but who is there in England to-day capable of giving any satisfactory reply to them? In order to form any judgment on these matters we should require to have the evidence still buried in our national archives beneath the dust of many centuries placed fairly and dispassionately before us. For myself, I may perhaps be permitted to say that a familiarity of some years with original and much-neglected sources has taught me as a first lesson and condition of knowledge, that I know little—or what, when compared to all that yet remains to be done, practically is very little—about the social condition, the influence and inner life of the Church of England previous to the sixteenth century. In spite of this, however, I venture here to propose for consideration an important question regarding the Church in this country during, say, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is a very simple point, but one I venture to think which has not hitherto been sufficiently considered, and one the answer to which must seriously affect our judgment as to the character of the ecclesiastical system swept away by the so-called Reformation.

The first duty of the Church, after the ministration of the Sacraments, is obviously to teach and direct its members in all matters of faith and practice, and to watch over the eternal interests of the Christian people. Was the pre-Reformation Church in England mindful of this obligation, or did it neglect so plain and essential a duty imposed upon all its ministers by its Divine Founder? This, then, is the plain question—Was there in Catholic days in England any systematic religious instruction? and if so, what was done in this important matter?

At the outset it must be admitted that the general opinion of Protestant writers has been, perhaps naturally, that in Catholic England the people were allowed to grow up in profound ignorance on all religious matters, and that there was no

systematic instruction on points of belief and observance given by the clergy. I cannot, moreover, shut my eyes to the fact that in this verdict many Catholic writers have concurred. Conversation likewise with Catholics, as well ecclesiastics as laymen, has led me to conclude that at the present day the general opinion is, that this sad and very black view of the way in which the Catholic Church of this country neglected its obvious duty of instructing the people in religion cannot be gainsaid.

It should, however, in all fairness be borne in mind, at the very outset, that up to the present time, so far as I am aware, no evidence whatever has been forthcoming, except the somewhat fervid declamations of those engaged in the destruction of the ancient faith, in support of this verdict; and one cannot but remember that barely ten years ago the English public generally implicitly believed in the traditional picture, drawn by non-Catholics in past centuries, of the appalling immoralities of monks and nuns, and the wholesale corruption of the clergy of England at the time of the suppression of the religious houses. We have lived to see a marvellous change follow upon the production of evidence. The unjust judgment after holding for many generations has now practically been reversed, and the unworthy stories originally "founded on ignorance and believed in only through the prejudice of subsequent generations have now," as the highest Protestant authority on the history of this period has declared, "gone for ever." This may well encourage a hope that an examination of evidence may lead to a similar rectification of what I firmly believe to be an equally false judgment passed upon the secular clergy of England in Catholic days, in regard to their neglect of the duty of instructing the people committed to their care.

I cannot help thinking that Chaucer's typical priest was not a mere creation of his imagination, but that the picture must have had its counterpart in numberless parishes in England in the fourteenth century. This is how the poet's priest is described :

A good man was ther of religioun,
And was a poure parsoun of a town;
But riche he was of holy thought and werk.
He was also a lerned man, a clerk,

That Christe's Gospel trewely wolde preche,
His parischens devoutly wolde he teche.

* * * * *

But Christe's love and his Apostles twelve
He taughte, but first he folwede it himselfe.

You will remember too that the story Chaucer makes his priest contribute to the "Canterbury Tales" is nothing but an excellent and complete tract, almost certainly a translation of a Latin theological treatise, upon the Sacrament of Penance.

As a sample, however, of what is popularly believed on this subject at the present day I will take the opinion of by no means an extreme party writer, Bishop Hobhouse. "Preaching," he says, "was not a regular part of the Sunday observances as now. It was rare, but we must not conclude from the silence of our MSS. (*i.e.*, churchwardens' accounts) that it was never practised." In another place he states upon what he thinks sufficient evidence "that there was a total absence of any system of clerical training, and that the cultivation of the conscience as the directing power of man's soul and the implanting of holy affections in the heart, seem to have been no part of the Church's system of guidance."

Further, in proof that this view as to the teaching of the English Church in the latter Middle Ages is held by even Catholics, I need only quote the words of a well-known writer, to be found in the DUBLIN REVIEW for July 1891 :

At the end of the fifteenth century [writes Mr. W. S. Lilly] the Church in England, as in the greatest part of Europe, was in a lamentable condition. There is a mass of evidence that multitudes of Christians lived in almost total ignorance of the doctrines, and in almost complete neglect of the duties of their faith. The *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria* formed the sum of the knowledge of their religion possessed by many, and not a few passed through the world without receiving any Sacrament save that of Baptism.

It is, of course, impossible for us to pass any opinion on the "mass of evidence" to which Mr. Lilly appeals in proof of the soundness of his sweeping condemnation of the Church, not in England merely, but "in the greater part of Europe," since he has only given us the result without furnishing us with the grounds of his judgment. For my own part I think that such general judgments must be untrustworthy, and that it is necessary —so different were the circumstances of each—to take every

country into consideration by itself. For Germany, the labours of the late Professor Janssen, even after the largest deductions have been made for a possible enthusiasm, or idealising, have conclusively proved the existence of abundant religious teaching during the century which preceded the coming of Luther. As to England, about which we are at present concerned, we can only suppose that Mr. Lilly has been engaged in researches of which, as yet, the world knows nothing. For many years having been occupied in collecting information upon this very point, I may at once say, that so far from my studies tending to confirm Mr. Lilly's verdict as to the "almost total ignorance of the doctrines," and almost "complete neglect of the duties of the faith" in which Catholics were allowed to live and die, have led me to the opposite conclusion—namely, that in pre-Reformation days the people were well instructed in their faith by priests, who faithfully discharged their plain duty in this regard.

Let me state the grounds of this opinion. For practical purposes we may divide the religious teaching given by the clergy into the two classes of *sermons* and *instructions*. The distinction is obvious; by the first are meant those set discourses to prove some definite theme, or expound some definite passage of Holy Scripture, or deduce the lessons to be learnt from the life of some saint. In other words, putting aside the controversial aspect, which, of course, was rare in those days, a sermon in mediæval times was much what a sermon is to-day. There was this difference, however, that in pre-Reformation days the sermon was not so frequent as in these modern times. Now, whatever instruction is given to the people at large is conveyed to them almost entirely in the form of set sermons, which, however admirable in themselves, seldom convey to their hearers consecutive and systematic, dogmatic and moral teaching. Mediæval methods of imparting religious knowledge were different. For the most part the priest fulfilled the duty of instructing his flock by plain, unadorned, and familiar instructions upon matters of faith and practice. These must have much more resembled our present catechetical instructions than our modern pulpit discourses. To the subject of set sermons I shall have occasion to return presently, but as vastly more important, at any rate in the opinion of our Catholic forefathers,

let us first consider the question of familiar instructions. For the sake of clearness we will confine our attention to the two centuries (the fourteenth and fifteenth) previous to the great religious revolution under Henry VIII.

Before the close of the thirteenth century—namely, in A.D. 1281, Archbishop Peccham issued the celebrated Constitutions of the Synod of Oxford which are called by his name. There we find the instruction of the people legislated for minutely :

We order [runs the Constitution] that every priest having the charge of a flock do, four times in each year (that is, once each quarter), on one or more solemn feast days, either himself or by someone else, instruct the people in the vulgar language simply and without any phantastical admixture of subtle distinctions, in the Articles of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Evangelical Precepts, the seven works of mercy, the seven deadly sins with their off-shoots, the seven principal virtues, and the seven Sacraments.

The Synod then proceeded to set out in considerable detail each of the points upon which the people must be instructed. Now it is obvious, that if four times a year this law was complied with in the spirit in which it was given, the people were very thoroughly instructed indeed in their faith. But, was this law faithfully carried out by the clergy, and rigorously enforced by the Bishops in the succeeding centuries ? That is the real question ! I think that there is ample evidence that it was. In the first place, the Constitutions of Peccham are referred to constantly in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as the foundation of the existing practices in the English Church. Then, to take a few specific instances in the middle of the fourteenth century, the decrees of a diocesan Synod order :

That all rectors, vicars, or chaplains holding Ecclesiastical offices shall expound clearly and plainly to their people, on all Sundays and feast days, the Word of God and the Catholic faith of the Apostles ; and that they shall diligently instruct their subjects in the Articles of Faith, and teach them in their native language the Apostles' Creed, and urge them to expound and teach the same faith to their children* (Wilkins, III. 11).

* Two curious instances of the care taken by the Bishops to see that priests were able to instruct their people may be quoted. After the great plague of 1349, as is notorious, many were admitted to holy orders in order to fill the decimated ranks of the clergy without sufficient learning and preparation. On June 24, 1385, the illustrious William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, caused Sir Roger Dene, rector of the Church of St. Michael, in Jewry Street, Winchester, to swear upon the Holy Gospels that he would learn within

Again in A.D. 1357, Archbishop Thoresby, of York, anxious for the better instruction of his people, commissioned a monk of St. Mary's York, named Gotryke, to draw out in English an exposition of the Creed, the Commandments, the seven deadly sins, &c. This tract the Archbishop, as he says in his preface, "through the counsel of his clergy, sent to all his priests" :

So that each and every one, who under him had the charge of souls, do openly, in English, upon Sundays teach and preach them, that they have cure of the law and the way to know God Almighty. And he commands and bids, in all that he may, that all who have keeping or cure under him, enjoin their parishioners and their subjects, that they hear and learn all these things, and oft, either rehearse them till they know them, and so teach them to their children, if they any have, when they are old enough to learn them ; and that parsons and vicars and all parish priests enquire diligently of their subjects at Lent time, when they come to shrift, whether they know these things, and if it be found that they know them not, that they enjoin them upon his behalf, and on pain of penance, to know them. And so there be none to excuse themselves through ignorance of them, our father the Archbishop of his goodness has ordained and bidden that they be showed openly in English amongst the flock.

To take another example, the Acts of the Synod held by Simon Langham at Ely in A.D. 1364 order that every parish priest frequently preach and expound the Ten Commandments, &c., in English (*in idiomate communi*), and all priests are urged to devote themselves to the study of the sacred Scripture, so as to be ready "to give an account of the hope and faith" that is in them. Further, they are to see that the children are taught their prayers ; and even adults, when coming to confession, are to be examined as to their religious knowledge (Wilkins, III., 59).

Even when the rise of the Lollard heretics rendered it important that some check should be given to general and unauthorised preaching, this did not interfere with the

twelve months the articles of faith ; the cases reserved to the Bishop, the Ten Commandments ; the seven works of mercy ; the seven mortal sins ; the Sacraments of the Church, and the form of administering and conferring them ; and also the form of baptizing, &c., as contained in the constitutions of Archbishop Peccham. The same year—on July 2—the bishop exacted from John Corbet, who had been instituted on June 2 previously to the rectory of Bradley, in Hants, a similar obligation to learn the same before the feast of St. Michael then next ensuing. In the former case, Roger Dene had been rector of Ryston, in Norfolk, and had only been instituted to his living at Winchester by the Bishop of Norwich, three days before William of Wykeham required him to enter into the above obligation.

ordinary work of instruction. The orders of Archbishop Arundel in A.D. 1408, forbidding all preaching without an episcopal license, set forth, in distinct terms, that this prohibition did not apply "to the parish priests," &c., who by the Constitutions of Archbishop Peccham, were bound to instruct their people, in simple language, on all matters concerning their faith and observance. And further, in order to check the practice of treating people to such formal and set discourses, these simple and practical instructions were ordered to be adopted without delay in all parish churches.

To this testimony of the English Church as to the value attached to popular instruction, I may add the authority of the Provincial Council of York held in A.D. 1466 by Archbishop Nevill. By its decrees, not only is the order as to systematic quarterly and simple instructions reiterated, but the points of the teaching are again set out, in great detail, by the Synod.

There is, moreover, I believe, ample evidence to convince any one who may desire to study the subject, that this duty of giving plain instructions to the people was not neglected up to the era of the Reformation itself. During the fifteenth century, manuals to assist the clergy in the performance of this obligation were multiplied in considerable numbers; which would not have been the case had the practice of frequently giving these familiar expositions fallen into abeyance. Of some of these manuals I shall speak presently, and here I would note specially that one of the earliest books ever issued from an English press by Caxton, probably at the same time (A.D. 1483) as the "Liber Festivalis" (or book of sermons for Sundays and feast-days), was a set of four lengthy discourses published as they expressly declare to enable priests to fulfil the obligation imposed on them by the Constitutions of Peccham.* As these were intended to take at least four Sundays, and as the whole set of instructions had to be given four times each year, it follows that at least sixteen Sundays, or a quarter of the year, was devoted to this simple and straightforward teaching, to

* Probably there were many similar works issued by the first English printers. In Lansd. MS. 379, there is a *black letter* tract, printed by W. de Worde, to enable priests to comply with the command of the Synod.

every soul in the parish, what every Christian was bound to believe and to do.*

Looking at the character of these instructions, we need not be surprised that priests should not often have thought it necessary to commit them to writing. They were given as a matter of course, as a necessary part of the round of their priestly duty, and there is naturally very little record of what must have been part of the routine of common clerical life. Let me take what is a parallel instance. Do we expect that some centuries hence there will be any evidence forthcoming to show that the clergy of the great city of London, in this year 1893, have been doing their duty in instructing the children of their schools in religious knowledge? Or, to put it another way: what explicit evidence is there likely to be, say a couple of hundred years hence (even if meantime there be no such wholesale destruction of documents as took place in the sixteenth century), that, say, the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is regularly administered by our Catholic clergy to-day? For the same reason it would be asking more than we have any right to expect, to demand formal documentary evidence of the performance of this plain and well-recognised duty of religious instruction.

We have, however, I expect, sufficient material to satisfy most people. The Episcopal, or Chapter, registers fortunately in some few cases contain documents recording the results of the regular visitation of parishes. It is almost by chance, of course, that papers of this kind have been preserved. Most of them would have been destroyed as possessing little importance

* The work upon which Caxton's "Liber Festivalis" was founded is a volume written in the early part of the fourteenth century by John Myrc. Of this see later. Here we may note that in several copies of the MSS. *Festivale* there may be found other matters useful for the priest in the work of instructing others. For example, "De magna sentencia pronuncianda, hoc modo;" the days on which no servile work might be done, according to Archbishop Arundel's "Constitutions," notes on various Papal constitutions, &c. In one MS. (Harl. MS., 2403), following upon the *Festivale*, is a short explanation of the Creed, *Pater Noster*, &c. This latter instruction is introduced by the form, "Good men and women, ye shall know well yt each curate is bownden by the law of Holy Church to expound the *Pater Noster* to his parischonys twyes in the yere." The substance of these instructions is used in many copies of the sermons of the period. In the copy (MS. Reg. 18 B. xxv.) the people are addressed as "Worschipful frendys," or "Worschipful and reverent frendys." The discourses for the time about Easter appear to have been prepared to preach before the Court, as they commence with the words, "Worschypful sufferanc and frendys."

in the eyes of those who ransacked the archives at the time of the change of religion. The testimony of these visitation papers as to the performance of this duty of instruction on the part of the clergy is most valuable. Hardly less important is the proof they afford of the intelligent interest taken by the lay-folk of the parish in the work, and of their capability of rationally and religiously appreciating the instructions given them by their clergy. The process of these visitations must be understood. First of all certain of the parishioners were chosen and examined upon oath as to the state of the parish, and as to the way in which the pastor performed his duties. As samples of these sworn depositions we may take what are to be found in a "Visitation of Capitular Manors and Estates of the Exeter Diocese," extracts from which have recently been printed by Prebendary Hingeston Randolph, in the Register of Bishop Stapeldon. The record of the Visitations comprises the first fifteen years of the fourteenth century; at one place, Colaton, we find the *jurati* depose that their parson preaches in his own way, and on the Sundays expounds the Gospels as well as he can (*quatenus novit*)! He does not give them much instruction (*non multum eos informat*), they think, in "the Articles of Faith, the Ten Commandments, and the deadly sins." At another place, the priest, one Robert Blond, "preaches, but," as appears to the witnesses, "not sufficiently clearly"; but they add, as if conscious of some hypercriticism, that they had long been accustomed to pastors who instructed them most carefully in all that pertained to the salvation of their souls. But these are the least satisfactory cases. In most instances the priest is said to instruct his people "well (*bene*) and excellently (*optime*)," and the truth of the testimony appears more clearly in places where, in other things, the parish-folk do not consider their priest quite perfection, as for instance at Culmstock, where the Vicar, Walter, is said to be too long over the Matins and Mass on feasts; or still more at St. Mary Church, where the people think that in looking after his worldly interests, their priest is somewhat too hard on them in matters of tithe.

The register from which these details are taken is a mere accidental survival, but the point that it is of importance to remember is this; that during Catholic times in the course of

every few years the clergy were thus personally reported upon, so to say, to the chief pastor or his delegates, and the oath of the witnesses is a proof of how gravely this duty was regarded. And here I may note in passing a fact little realised or even understood, namely, that one of the great differences between ecclesiastical life in the Middle Ages and in modern times lies in the fact that then people had no chance of going to sleep. There was a regular system of periodical visitations, and everything was brought to the test of inquiry of a most elaborate and searching kind, in which every corner was swept out.

In this special instance, before passing on, I would call attention to the manifest intelligence, in spiritual things, shown by these jurors—peasants and farmers—in out-of-the-way parishes of clod-hopping Devon, in the early years of the fourteenth century. I have a doubt whether, notwithstanding the Board-schools, any of our own country parish-folk could do better at the present day.

To assist parish priests in the preparation of these familiar discourses, various manuals were drawn up during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is possible now to refer to only one or two of the best known, for as a fact a large number of such works may be found in our national MSS. collections. I will first name the volume called “*Pars Oculi Sacerdotis*,” which was probably composed either by a certain William Pagula, or Walter Parker, about the middle of the fourteenth century. It was very popular and much sought after. It is named frequently in inventories and wills, and has thus sometimes been an evident puzzle to editors. No less than five complete copies, as well as several fragments, are among the MSS. in the British Museum. It well deserved its popularity among the pre-Reformation clergy, for it not only furnishes most useful matter for the usual parish instructions, but is really a very complete manual of teaching on almost every detail of clerical life. One portion of the tract is devoted to the subject of the parochial discourses, which the author declares have to be given by all priests once in each quarter. In delivering these the priest is urged to be as simple as possible in his language, and to suit himself in every way to his audience.*

* Some further account of this important tract may be given with advan-

In another treatise closely resembling this "Pars Oculi Sacerdotis"—so closely, indeed, that it has sometimes been mistaken for a portion of it—is the better known "Pupilla Oculi" of John de Burgo, or Borough, the rector of Collingham in A.D. 1385. It was only to a certain extent original, for, as the author states in his preface, he has called it "Pupilla Oculi," "because it is to a large extent drawn from another work entitled 'Oculus Sacerdotis.'" This manual also was evidently much in demand by the clergy. Numerous manuscript copies of it are in existence, and it has been printed several times. One edition, that of A.D. 1510, was issued from the press by the printer Wolfgang at the expense of an English merchant of London named William Bretton, and was sold, as the title-page sets forth, at Pepwell's

tage. The tract begins by instructing the priest on the *praxes confessarii*: the kind of questions it is well to ask from various people—e.g., religious, secular priests, merchants, soldiers, &c. Then comes a method of examination of conscience in detail, &c. The priest is advised to urge his penitents to say seven times daily the *Pater* and *Creed* to correspond to the seven canonical hours. Should any one be found not to know these he is to be enjoined to learn them, together with the *Ave Maria*, at once. The confessor is to inculcate a devotion to the Guardian Angels upon those who come to him, and teach them some little verses to say in order to beg the protection of their guardian spirits. The verse given in the "Dextra Pars Oculi" may be Englished thus :

Oh ! angel who my guardian art,
Thro' God's paternal love ;
Defend and shield and rule the charge,
Assigned thee from above.

From vice's stain preserve my soul,
Oh ! gentle angel bright ;
In all my life be thou my stay,
To all my steps the light.

Then follows the various modes of absolving from excommunication, &c., and in this connection copies of the reserved cases, with the *Magna Carta*, the *Carta de Foresta*, the keeping of which was enforced in A.D. 1254 by ecclesiastical censures.

The second part of the "Dextra Pars Oculi" deals minutely and carefully with the instructions which a priest should give his people, not only as to matters of belief, but as to decorum and behaviour in church, cemetery, &c. These materials for instructions are arranged under some thirty-one headings. Following on this are the explanations of the familiar instructions which priests were bound to give to their people four times a year and sermons on various subjects, chiefly on *temptations*.

The third part of the volume, entitled the *Sinistra Pars Oculi*, is in fact a careful treatise on the Sacraments. The instructions upon the Blessed Eucharist are especially good, and in the course of them many matters of English practice are touched upon and explanation is given of the ceremonies of the Mass.

bookshop in St. Paul's Churchyard.* Both the "Pars Oculi" and the "Oculus Sacerdotis" bear a close resemblance to another tract called the "Regimen Animarum,"† which was apparently compiled as early as A.D. 1343.

Another sample of these priests' manuals, chiefly intended to furnish material for popular instruction, is a fourteenth-century tract called the "Speculum Christiani." It was composed by one John Watton with the distinct purpose, as the preface informs us, of aiding the clergy in giving the teaching commanded by the Constitutions of Archbishop Pecham. In many ways the "Speculum Christiani" is the most useful and important of this class of manuals. A considerable portion is given in English, each division, for example, being prefaced by simple rhymes in the vernacular, giving the chief points to be borne in mind. In fifteenth-century sermons I have frequently met with these rude rhymes, introduced into the text of a discourse, as if they were perfectly well known to the audience. At haphazard I take a couple of examples. The First Commandment is summed up thus :

* Its full title is "Pupilla oculi omnibus presbyteris precipue Anglicanis necessaria." On the back of the title-page of the 1510 edition is a letter from Augustine Aggeus to W. Bretton. After saying that societies exist to propagate books, the author declares that Bretton has been induced to print the *Pupilla* by a desire that the rites and sacraments of the Church should be better known, and to secure "that nowhere in the English Church" these rites should be badly observed or understood. It is clear from the letter that W. Bretton had already had other works printed in the same way, and it is known that amongst those works were copies of Lyndwode's "Provinciale" (1505), "Psalterium et Hymni" (1506), "Horæ," &c. (1506), "Speculum Spiritualium," and Hampole, "De Emendatione Vita" (1510) (cf. *Ames* (ed. Herbert), iii. p. 16). Pepwell, the publisher, at the sign of the *Holy Trinity*, was the same who published many books printed abroad, and had dealings with Bishops Stokesley and Tunstall.

† The prologue to the "Regimen Animarum" (Harl. MS. 2272, fol. 2) says the work is compiled chiefly from the "Summa Summarum Raymundi," "Summa Confessorum," "Veritates Theologie," "Pars oculi Sacerdotis," &c. The work is divided into three parts: (1) *De Moribus et scientia presbyterorum et aliorum clericorum*, (2) *De exhortationibus et doctrinis bonis erga subditos suos faciendis*, (3) *De septem Sacramentis*.

In the second part the priest is urged to instruct his people constantly *in English*, and no one who will examine this portion can fail to be struck at the minute character of these instructions. It may be noted that at fol. 91b the priest is urged to teach his people to bow at the sacred name, and to add the name *Jesus* to the end of the *Ave Maria*, and to explain to them the indulgences granted to such as do so by Popes John XXII. and Urban IV.

The third part begins, in this copy, at fol. 132, and treats the Sacraments most fully. In speaking of *Confirmation*, the necessity of *consecrated oil* is insisted upon. The volume closes with a description and explanation of the canon of the Holy Mass.

Thou shalt love thy God with heart entire,
 With all thy soul and all thy might,
 And other God in no manner
 Thou shalt not have by day nor night.

And the precept of keeping holy certain days is prefaced by the following :

Thy holy days keep well also,
 From worldly works take thou thy rest ;
 All thy household the same shall do,
 Both wife and child, servant and beast.

The number of copies of the "Speculum Christiani" to be found in the Museum collection of MSS. is some ten or twelve, and this may be taken as evidence of its popularity in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It was translated into English by one John Byrd in the latter century, and was one of the earliest books ever put into type in England. An edition was printed in London by William of Machlin, at the expense of a London merchant, about A.D. 1480, and in the first decade of the sixteenth century it was reprinted, but without the English verses, at least three times.* I cannot pass from a brief notice of this excellent manual of instructions without pointing out that in it may be found some beautiful prayers to the Blessed Sacrament and our Lady, which were formerly used by our Catholic ancestors. The English verses beginning :

Mary Mother, wel thou bee,
 Mary Mother, think on me,

I should like to see reprinted, and, indeed, the entire manual deserves to be better known than it is amongst us to-day.†

* The Museum has four printed copies : (1) the supposed print of 1480 ; (2) a copy of 1500, printed at Paris ; (3) another of 1502 ; and (4) one printed by Thomas Rees, A.D. 1513, in London. The later copies have no English verses ; but that they were intended for English use seems clear from the fact that the prologue to the volume, in which the author says that it is intended to furnish priests with material for the instructions they are bound to give by the constitutions of Peccham, is reprinted.

† Besides the volumes named in the text there are a considerable number of works of much the same kind. One such is the "Flos Florum," a copy of which is among the Burney MS. (No. 356) in the British Museum. It is divided into five-and-twenty books, the first being occupied with an explanation of the Lord's Prayer ; the second with a tract on the virtues and vices ; the third with an account of the priest's personal duties ; the fifth with notes on the teaching which parish priests are bound to give to their people.—Another book is called "Cilium Oculi Sacerdotes," and is divided into two parts. The first treats about clerical duties, and especially of the duties of a con-

Space obliges me to pass rapidly on to the second point for our consideration—that of preaching proper in the two centuries before the Reformation era. I would, however, ask you to believe that the question of popular instruction has only been touched upon. I could give many other examples of manuals such as I have here introduced to notice, and I have said nothing whatever of what may be called formal theological text-books, all of which were, of course, calculated to aid the clergy, in what the great Grosseteste calls, “as much a part of the *cura pastoralis* as the administration of the Sacraments.” I must, however, give one word of warning. When writers talk of people being taught their *Pater*, something very different is meant from the mere repetition of the words. A large number of systematic instructions during the Middle Ages were based upon the explanation of the “Our Father.” Any one who may care to pursue this subject cannot but be amazed at the ingenious way the petitions of the Lord’s Prayer are made the pegs on which to hang a definite course of teaching on the whole of Christian doctrine.*

It is impossible to consider the subject of that systematic religious instruction which was constantly being repeated in mediæval times without wondering whether it had its proper effect upon the minds of the people. The proof of the wisdom of our forefathers is, I think, sufficiently evidenced by the history of the change of religion throughout Europe in the sixteenth century. In other words (confining our attention to England), the way in which the Catholic faith had to be uprooted from the minds of the people is surely a proof that they had been well grounded in it. Now that the real facts are becoming known it is beginning to be suspected in several

fessor ; the second part is a tract upon the Ten Commandments. Here, as in so many similar works, some interesting points of practice in Catholic England are touched upon. For example, we read that every rector of a parish should have a cleric to assist him at the public Mass, and to read the epistle. This cleric may be vested in an alb, and besides Church duty should teach the children the creed, “*id est*, their faith,” and their “letters,” besides “teaching the singing” (Harl. MS. 4968).

* Harl. MS. 1648, for example, is an instance of a book of instructions in Christian doctrine founded upon the petitions of the Lord’s Prayer. It is arranged in tabular form, and is most ingeniously devised to convey a great amount of solid instruction. The key to the arrangement is on fol. 1b, where it is said, *Per istas septem petitiones impetrantur septem dona Spiritus Sancti, que extrahunt a corde septem peccata mortalia et plantant in corde septem virtutes principales que nos perducunt ad septem beatitudines ad ejus merita.*”

quarters that the change of religion was brought about, not by the spontaneous acceptance by the people of Protestantism in place of the Catholic faith, but by a process of systematic and deliberate religious starvation. And taking a comprehensive survey, the Reformation in Europe, as a whole, was by no means a popular movement ; but, for the most part, the new faith was only, after many a struggle, imposed upon nations by force and the will of the Prince.

But let us turn to the question of *sermons* in the later Middle Ages. The work of instruction may be said roughly to have been the special office of the secular clergy. In the same general way preaching may be regarded as coming within the special province of the religious orders. Of course in such general statements the limit must be taken as understood ; and as a fact, at the outset, it is necessary to guard ourselves against the impression that, because the Friars gave a great impulse to popular preaching, it began with them ; just as it is useful to guard against the notion that it was Wicliff who introduced the preaching of vernacular sermons. Indeed, unless the accounts of the preaching of the Friars in the thirteenth century are mere myths, of this latter there can be no question whatever. The Dominicans and Franciscans were essentially popular preachers in the truest sense of the word. They went from village to village speaking to the people wherever they could, in public places as well as in the churches. They gathered their audiences together on the great roadways as readily as in consecrated spots. For the most part they had to do with the masses, and plain, unadorned speaking was their *forte*. As a rule they made no attempt at set and polished discourses, refraining from elaborate argument or the discussion of abstract questions. They extemporised their teaching, suiting it to the needs of the moment, and pointing their moral with anecdotes, fables, and examples. Hence their triumph. The people followed them in crowds, hung upon their words, were carried away by their earnest—albeit perhaps rough—eloquence, and made their conquest easy. But even the Friars (a century and a half be it noted before Wicliff's “poor priests”) by no means commenced, though they certainly gave an impetus to, the practice of vernacular preaching. From the earliest times the people were spoken to in the

language they could understand. St. Bede, for example, describes the crowds of Saxons who flocked to their churches to hear the words of the Christian missionaries. What has misled so many writers, apparently, is the fact that the sermons which have been preserved to us from the Middle Ages are for the most part in Latin. This is true; but it is no less a fact that the preachers of those days used to compose discourses in Latin which they afterwards delivered in English, a practice which I fear might seem strange, or even intolerable, to the immense majority of the country clergymen, who in these more cultured days have received the best education the national universities can afford.

In the same way as the work of instruction proper took a fixed form, so that of preaching was fashioned on a well-understood and well-recognised model. A short exordium, following upon the chosen text of Scripture, led almost invariably to a prayer for Divine guidance and assistance, which concluded with the *Pater* and *Ave*, and only then did the preacher address himself to the development of his subject. For the most part, until comparatively recent times, which have introduced somewhat strange themes into the sacred pulpit, the sermon was based almost entirely upon the Bible, and generally upon the Gospel, or other Scripture, proper for the day. This practice, whilst it imbued the minds of those who listened with a thorough knowledge of the sacred writings, give the sermons as we read them now so great a similarity that we are apt to regard them as generally dull and uninteresting. With rare exceptions it is clear that, in England at least, brilliant, startling, and sensational sermonising was not regarded with favour, but, on the contrary, was looked on with suspicion, as savouring of the “treatise,” or method of the schools, and founded on the practice of heretics.

Numerous tracts of the art of preaching, drawn up for the use of our English preachers during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, are still to be seen in our public libraries. I shall here refer only to one, written somewhere in the middle of the fourteenth century by the celebrated Dominican, Thomas Waleys, in order to teach the mode and form of pulpit oratory, in what he then describes as the “modern style.” The whole tract is instructive, but I will here give only a

brief epitome of the first chapter, which treats of “the preacher.” He should, the master declares, undertake the duty, not from vanity or love of notoriety, but from pure love of God’s truth ; and prayer and study should go before his work. As to his gestures, he should endeavour not to stand like a statue, nor to throw himself about regardless of decorum. He is to refrain from shouting, and not to speak so low that his audience have to strain to catch his words. He is not to speak too rapidly, nor to hesitate “like a boy who repeats lessons he does not quite understand.” The theme should be spoken with great distinctness, so that all may understand the subject, and, if necessary, it should be repeated. Before his discourse the preacher should retire to some private place and thoroughly practise the sermon he is about to deliver, with the method of declamation, the gestures, and even the expressions of countenance suitable to its various parts. Finally, the author urges the advisability of having some candid and reliable friend to listen to the discourse, who will correct the faults of pronunciation, &c., when it is over. This is not such bad advice to preachers, given at a time when we are asked to believe that sermons were almost unknown ! *

Turning to the material aids to the intending preacher, we can describe them—even in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—as really vast. Confining our attention, of course, to England only, we may, in the first place, note some collections of sermons for Sundays and feast-days very popular in the fifteenth century. The first course of such sermons I will mention is that drawn up by John Felton, the Vicar of St. Mary Magdalen and Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. His discourses won for him the name of *homiliarius*, or *consciavior*,

* Friar Waleys, in other places in this tract—“ De Arte Predicandi ”—gives much excellent advice from which we may cull one or two points. Speaking of the *subject* of a sermon, he says that it is the custom (*consuetudo apud modernos*) of always having some text upon which to found a discourse. This should be a real theme, taken from Holy Scripture, and always from the Lesson, Epistle, or Gospel of the day, except on great feasts, such as Easter. Generally it should be a sentence, but sometimes it is best to take the whole Epistle or Gospel and explain its meaning, for “this kind of preaching is easy and very often greatly profitable to ordinary people.” The author warns the preacher that he is not to think sermons are merely arguments ; a discourse should not only convince the mind, but lead it to good affections and implant in it devout thoughts. He urges priests never to finish a sermon without some mention of Our Lady, Christ’s passion, or eternal happiness.

and his course of Sunday sermons—some fifty-eight in number, and of which there are many copies among the Museum manuscripts—were much used by subsequent preachers. In his preface our author states, that on account of the poverty of those who are students in moral and dogmatic theology, and consequently by reason of the few books they are able to obtain to help them, he has been induced by the importunity of friends to draw up, for the use of any priest having the cure of souls, a course of sermons founded on the Gospels of the Sundays. “They are,” he adds, “merely the crumbs I have collected as they have fallen from the tables of my masters, whose names I have given in the margin.” A note in one of the copies among the Harleian MSS. says that the sermons were published in the year 1431.* They are, I fancy, for our modern taste too much divided and subdivided, and I have little doubt they would be to-day voted “dry.” Various authorities are cited in the margin, as for example Waleys’, the “Vitae Patrum,” &c., and stories are frequently introduced to drive home a point, or fix the attention on a moral. Although the series is complete, I fancy the discourses were really intended rather as a help to the priest in the preparation of his Sunday sermon than as a collection of sermons to be preached exactly as they are set down. The stories, for example, are often mere indications of what were then doubtless well-known anecdotes, but the memory of which has long since perished. Especially is this the case where English and local examples are referred to, as: “Note about the man in Bristol”; or “About the woman in London, to whom our Lord showed His heart.” At the end of every copy of these Sunday discourses

* In one copy of these “*Sermones Dominicales*” (Harl. MS. 868, fol. 2) is the following note: “In nomine Dne nre Ihu Xpe cui sit honor et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen. Hoc opus completum fuit a venerabili viro Domino, Joho Felton, vicario perpetuo ecclesia parsch. Beate Marie Magdalene, Oxon; Lincoln dioc. in anno Dne: Mcccxxxii.” Leland says of John Felton: “He was an eager student of philosophy and theology; (yet) the mark towards which he earnestly pressed with eye and mind was none other than that by his continual exhortations he might lead the dwellers on the Isis from the filth of their vices to the purity of virtue.” Besides the “*Sermones Dominicales*,” in some copies (e.g., Harl. MS. 5396, fols. 143–209) there is another collection of fifty sermons of a more miscellaneous nature. In his illustrative stories he uses Pliny, Seneca, &c., freely, and as a rule the sermon is shorter than the more formal discourse for the Sunday. Besides set sermons Felton drew up for the use of preachers and other teachers an “*Alphabetum Theologicum*,” from the works of Bishop Grosseteste.

I have examined, there is a careful and copious subject-index; and many indications are given, by subsequent sermon-writers, of the influence of this collection upon the preaching of the age.

Another set of sermons, evidently much in use in the fifteenth century, and many copies of which are still in existence, is that known as the "Liber Festivalis" of John Mirk, a canon regular of Lilleshull. This author is perhaps best known by his tract entitled "Instructions for Parish Priests," which was published some years ago by the Early English Text Society. He lived much about the same time as Felton, namely, about the middle of the fifteenth century, and his sermons were intended for use on the higher festivals of the Christian year. I should like to quote a few words of his preface, putting it, however, into modern English.

God, maker of all things [he says], be at our beginning, and give us all His blessing, and bring us all to a good ending, Amen. By my own feeble lecture I feel how it fareth with others that are in the same degree (as I am), who having charge of souls are obliged to teach their parishioners on all the principal feasts of the year. But many have as excuse, the want of books and the difficulty of reading, and therefore to help such mean clerks, as I am myself, I have drawn this treatise.

The sermons themselves are short, and frequently afford interesting information as to Catholic practices in those days. There is always one, and often there are two or more anecdotes, and whilst many of these may perhaps appear to us somewhat grotesque and absurd, a study of the whole series of sermons cannot but impress us with a belief that the priest who could use them must have been upon terms of most familiar intercourse with his people, and unless religious instruction had been constantly and regularly given, he never could have talked to them as he is made to do in these sermons.*

* A few extracts from some of these popular instructions on the feasts of the Church may be given. The following, addressed, as the rubric directs at the *Tenebæ*, or office of Matins, on the last days of Holy Week, after the Hours were finished, and "before the discipline is given to the people," was to be addressed to them "good men and women, as you see, these three days, the service is said at eventide in darkness. Wherefore it is called among you 'tenabulles,' but holy Church calleth it *tenebras*: that is to say, 'darkness,' and why this service is performed in darkness the holy fathers assign three reasons," &c. The people are then urged to be present at these services, and to obey the common practice of coming to them in silence and thinking upon Christ's passion.

In the instruction on Maundy Thursday, after explaining that the Church

The "Liber Festivalis," printed by Caxton in A.D. 1483, although by no means identical with John Mirk's, is practically founded upon it. It has sermons for nineteen Sundays and ferias, commencing with the first Sunday of Advent and ending with *Corpus Christi* day. These are followed by discourses for forty-three of the chief holidays and Saints' days of the year, and one sermon, suited for the anniversary of the dedication of a parish church. Then come somewhat detailed explanations of the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Commandments, &c. At the close of the fifteenth century the general popularity of the "Liber Festivalis" may be gauged by the fact that it was printed twice by Caxton, twice by Wynkyn de Worde, twice by Pynson, once by an English printer, whose name is unknown, in A.D. 1486, and thrice abroad before the close of the century.

The foregoing are samples of the many collections of sermons—chiefly for the Sundays of the year—which were clearly used by the English preachers in discharge of their duty of teaching, in the later Middle Ages. But besides these collected sermons, which might be either used to draw material from, or preached just as they stood, there were many books intended for the purpose of helping priests in the preparation of their discourses. As an example of these aids to preachers, we may take the well-known "Summa Predicantium," drawn up by the English Dominican, John Bromyard, about the beginning of the fifteenth century. There is a good copy in the King's Library at the British Museum, which formerly belonged to the Rochester Monastic Library. The book—a very large thick folio volume—is drawn up alphabetically, and information can thus be obtained with the greatest facility on most matters upon which a preacher is likely to need instruction. An examination of its contents will prove to any one

calls it "Our Lord's Supper day," the author continues: "It is also in Englis long schere thursday, for in owr olde fadur dayes men wolden yt day makon sheron hem honest, and dode here hedes and clyppon here berdes and so makon hem honest agen astur day; for ye moroze yei woldon done here body non ese, but suffur penaunce, in mynde of Hym yt suffurd so harte for hem. On Saturday thai myghte nozze whyle, what for long service, what for othur occupacion that that haddon for the weke comynge," &c. In the sermons there are many indications of Catholic practice, as for example, that procession was made to the font of the church for the seven days after its blessing on Holy Saturday. In the short instruction on the Assumption, the author introduces a hymn to our Blessed Lady, which he urges his audience to learn by heart and constantly repeat.

who doubts that it must have been a mine of wealth to a priest engaged in the work of preaching. Bromyard's work was printed abroad, twice in the fifteenth century and again in the middle of the sixteenth.*

Another work, similar to the "Summa Predicantium," was drawn up by Alan of Lynn, a Carmelite, who wrote much in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The mere list of his works fills the best part of a closely-printed page of Tanner, and a large portion of his labours was directed to lighten the work of preachers in the preparation of their sermons. Of course the writers of the period drew much, especially on all matters concerning natural history, from the work of Bartholomew the Englishman—sometimes called Glanville—a Minorite friar who taught in France during the thirteenth century. His book, "De Proprietatibus Rerum," alongside of that of Vincent of Beauvais, was the Encyclopædia of the Middle Ages, and all his facts were arranged with a moral and religious object. It was translated into English by Trevisa in A.D. 1398 and had been printed in fourteen or fifteen editions before the year 1500.†

In sermons of the period, about which we are engaged, I

* The theological *common-place books* which still exist in MS. prove that the clergy often took great pains to adapt their studies to the work of teaching. To take an example: Harl. MS. 2344, is a theological note-book certainly used, and possibly drawn up in the fifteenth century by one John Chapman, "Rector of Honey-lane," London. Chapman was a doctor in theology, and, from 1493 to 1505, appears to have sometimes occupied the pulpit at Paul's Cross, since he gives, on the first leaf of his note-book, a list of his sermons delivered in that celebrated London pulpit. The interest of the small volume lies in the fact that it is a collection of notes on a great variety of theological matters. They are in a form which would probably be considered most useful for referring to. In the margin a number is set against each *distinction*, thus,

71] and at the end is an alphabetical index—e.g., *De Pilati et Herodis concordia mistice intellectu* [71] .

† The work of another Dominican, Robert Holcot, called "Pro Christi verbum Evangelizantibus," deserves to be mentioned as much used in the fourteenth and fifteenth century. Wood states that Holcot was "first a lawyer, and afterwards a friar preacher." He studied at Oxford, and was the friend of Richard de Bury, Bishop of Durham. He was a great lecturer on Holy Scripture, and is said, with some probability, to have been the real author of the "Philobiblion," now claimed for Richard de Bury. His work in aid of preachers was printed in Paris in 1510 and 1513. Besides this a small work, which may be described as skeleton sermons for the "Themata Dominicalia," was drawn up by him, and is known as the "Dieta Salutis." Seven or eight copies of this work are among the British Museum MSS. Holcot died in the fatal year of the great plague, 1349.

have met with many references to a work evidently very similar to Bromyard's "Summa," called the "Alphabetum Predicantium." The work also of another English Dominican, Nicholas Gorham—"Thema et distinctiones"—furnished not only the skeleton for a sermon, but material wherewith to clothe it, arranged alphabetically and with a good index of words. The influence of Gorham can be traced in the preachers whose works have come down to us (although, by the way, his name is not even mentioned in the great "National Biographical Dictionary").* One Northern priest, Robert Ripon, probably a monk of Durham, for example, is constantly quoting him as his authority. The volume of sermons by this Durham monk may be noted in passing. It is not a complete course, but a somewhat miscellaneous collection. The Sundays of Lent, for example, and those of the Spring quarter, have often as many as eight sermons for a single day, and there are some six or eight discourses preached at various Synods at Durham. In one of these the preacher strongly urges upon all who have the care of souls a diligent study of the Bible, for he says: "Curates are bound to have a knowledge of Scripture, for preaching the Word of God to their people." Running through all the sermons *de Synodis*, moreover, is the same plain demand for learning and piety of life on the part of the priest, and the same insistence upon the obligation they were under to preach constantly to their people.

The study of Scripture urged by this Northern preacher must certainly have been practised throughout the whole period of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. We have remarked before that the sermons were, as a rule, Scriptural expositions, illustrated chiefly from the Holy Writ, and it is impossible to read them without rising from the study with a profound belief in the detailed knowledge of the Bible possessed alike by priest and people. The clergy from early times had vast storehouses, both of Biblical and patristic knowledge in the great *glossed*

* Gorham was certainly an Englishman (see Tanner). He was apparently first a fellow of Merton College, Oxford, and subsequently became a Dominican, and, going abroad, was confessor to Philip the Fair of France. He taught much in Paris, and was esteemed an eloquent preacher. He died in A.D. 1298. The Sunday sermons in Harl. MS. 755, fols. 1-148, were attributed by Warley to Gorham, at least in part. His book of Dominical sermons was printed at Paris in 1509, under the title of the "Golden Foundation."

texts, which, together with the words of Scripture, presented the interpretations given by the chief fathers of the Church. Before the close of the fourteenth century, moreover, the great value of an index for the purposes of study had been recognised in England, and many earnest workers had devoted their energies mainly to throwing open, by means of their *tabulae*, or indexes, what had hitherto been unworked and closed mines of buried knowledge. The value of this all-important labour has not been sufficiently recognised in the past; but, amongst those conspicuous in this work, we may name Alan, the Carmelite, of Lynn, and later than him, Abbot Whethamsted of St. Albans. A glance at the works of the former will show all that he did in this matter. Concordances and subject-indexes to the Bible, specially for the use of preachers, were multiplied in the early part of the fifteenth century; and the works of the fathers, chronicles, and even the sermons, of such a comparatively recent preacher as Bishop Grosseteste, had copious and well-arranged indexes made to them.

Whilst upon this subject I cannot refrain from calling attention to the great Catalogue of Monastic and Collegiate Libraries of England, drawn up in the fourteenth century by a monk of Edmundsbury "for the use and profit," as he says, "of students and preachers." For this reason it was called by him a *Promptuarium*. The list is arranged so that by the help of numbers attached to each monastery it might at once be seen where any given work could be found in the English fourteenth-century libraries. Thus, for example, suppose a student or preacher wished to consult the sermons of St. Anselm, a glance at Boston of Bury's list would show him the numbers 89, 43, 19, 116, 166, and 65 placed against the title of this work. Turning next to the key list of Monastic libraries, he would at once be able to tell that complete copies were to be seen in the libraries of Bermondsey, Woburn, St. Paul's, London, Shrewsbury, Hexham, and Ramsey. The use made of this catalogue for preaching purposes is evidenced by the way in which the Franciscans subsequently arranged the list of libraries for their own members, to correspond with the seven "Custodies," or divisions, into which the Franciscan province of England was apportioned. But, although no account of the preaching in the two centuries, before the change of religion, would have

been complete without some mention of this gigantic work of Boston of Bury, I have been able, of course, merely to refer to it. To do justice to it, the subject would require an article to itself.

Before passing away from the question of material aids to preachers in the later mediæval period, it is proper to advert briefly to the various collections of stories intended to adorn and lighten the dulness of ordinary discourses. Tales, examples, and even fables with moral applications were apparently introduced into the pulpit in very early times. From the days of St. Gregory the Great the practice of pointing a moral by the relation of an anecdote is clearly evidenced, but its ordinary use may be said to date from the rise of the Dominicans in the thirteenth century. Very shortly afterwards collections of "histories," suitable for the purpose, began to appear. In A.D. 1294, for example, a Dominican, Etienne de Besançon, composed his "Alphabetum exemplorum" believing, as he says in his preface, that "an example is more efficacious than the most subtle preaching." From the first the authorities were urgent as to the need of caution in the use of these embellishments, but the practice once introduced soon became general. Even before the close of the thirteenth century Dante refers, with some regret, to the growing habit of making people laugh in sermons. But Chaucer's *pardoner* knew well the taste of lay people for pulpit stories when he says :

For lewed (*i.e.*, unlearned) people loven tales olde.

The well-known "Gesta Romanorum," probably of English origin, the "Vitæ Patrum," and the lives of the saints generally, furnished the mediæval preacher with ample material for his anecdotes, and many collections of appropriate stories, arranged under useful moral headings, were at hand to assist him. Local colouring is often met with, and several volumes of *Historettes* for English preachers, drawn up in the fourteenth century, are known. Quite recently one such work, by a hitherto unknown English Franciscan writer, Nicholas Bozon, has been published in France ; and the evident common origin of stories found in sermons of the fifteenth century shows, as we should have expected, that there was no lack of material of this kind.

I have pointed out that for the most part parochial sermons

were founded upon Scripture—chiefly upon the Scripture proper for the Sunday—upon which they were preached. There are, however, of course, many examples of set discourses at this period upon other, and, as some may think, more entertaining themes. The subject is so vast that I can give but few examples of such sermons. The first collection of English set discourses I recall to mind, not to speak of the great Grosseteste, is that of the sermons of the celebrated Richard FitzRalph, Archbishop of Armagh—a learned man, best known, perhaps, as the uncompromising opponent of the privileges claimed by the Mendicant Friars.* Although written in Latin, the discourses were, as they expressly state, preached in English. Many were delivered in the choir of Lichfield Cathedral during the time FitzRalph was dean; others were preached in the cemetery of the hospital, in the Chapel of St. Nicholas, and elsewhere in the City and neighbourhood; whilst others again were delivered at St. Paul's Cross, London, and at various other places in England and Ireland. It may seem somewhat strange, perhaps, that the sermons of so well known a man as FitzRalph have never been printed, but such is the case. I note that on more than one occasion FitzRalph, preaching about the year 1340, is said to have commenced his sermon by reading the whole Gospel in English—an interesting and significant fact. The most celebrated of these discourses were preached in A.D. 1356 at St. Paul's Cross, and in them he

* FitzRalph was born at Dundalk, co. Louth. Some of his early life was spent in the household of that learned lover of books, Richard de Bury, Bishop of Durham. Amongst his companions here were Thomas Bradwardine, afterwards archbishop, Walter Burley, and Robert Holcot, afterwards the celebrated Dominican preacher. When, as Archbishop of Armagh, FitzRalph was asked to preach at St. Paul's upon the great question of the friars' privileges, Richard Kilmington, also an old friend of his, was dean. In his work, "Defensio Curatorum," the archbishop says that having come to London on business connected with his see, he found great disputes going on between the secular clergy and the Mendicant orders, and after much pressing he consented to preach on the subject at the Cross, *in vulgari*, some eight sermons. His propositions gave great offence to the Minorites, and he was summoned to Rome to answer their accusations. His chief contention appears to be that people ought to confess to their parish priest in their parish church at least once a year, just as they were bound to make their offerings in their own parish church twice or three times yearly. He complains that the friars used their faculties to entice children to join them, and that once they entered their ranks not even parents were allowed to see their sons except in the presence of professed friars. He adds that, for fear of the influence exerted by members of the Mendicant orders, parents were beginning to hesitate about sending their children to Oxford.

fiercely attacked the Friars' privileges. They are certainly bold and vigorous enough in their language, and we cannot but be astonished at the way the Archbishop, speaking on behalf of the Bishops of England, could possibly have addressed himself to so burning a question in the public pulpit at St. Paul's. We judge, however, that he was not entirely free from interruption, for he tells us himself that, in reply to an objection raised by a friend of the Friars in one of these celebrated sermons, he replied: "If you will prove that our Lord ever really begged His bread, I will give you this Bible I hold in my hand."

St. Paul's Cross, be it remarked by the way, at that time and for many years before, "of which there is no memory," says Stowe, was the most celebrated pulpit in England. Some of the sermons preached there help us to realise a scene now long passed away, and to fix a spot upon which, in ages past, so many London audiences have gathered to listen to the voice of the most renowned preachers of the time. The very memory of the spot has almost faded away. It stood—a raised platform beneath a great timber cross—in the open air, and in the midst of the chief burial-ground of the metropolis. There, except in bad weather, when the covered space, called "the shrowds," was used, the great English sermons of the day were preached; and the site often suggested a moral to the speaker. "The audience of the dead bodies under your feet," one is reported to have said, "is as great and greater, as good and better, than you."

Learned and greatly interesting as are the sermons of Archbishop FitzRalph, they cannot, in my estimation, compare with those of another English preacher, whose name I need not give, who lived but a few years later, and who often occupied the pulpit at St. Paul's Cross, and must have deeply stirred the hearts of his audience by his exceptional eloquence. His sermons are, I fancy, but little known, but there are more than 250 of them in existence. Though preached in English, they were written in free or even elegant Latin, and, if only by reason of the many historical and topical allusions to be found in them, they fully deserve a place among the monuments of our national literature. I only wish that time would permit me to quote a few samples, not only of this preacher'

eloquence, but of the manly vigour with which he publicly attacked abuses, even in the highest places of the land.

The foregoing are imperfect, and, I admit most fully, but detached specimens of the information which lies ready at hand, but which, I fear, is little attended to either by the popular writer or the learned historian. In fact, the difficulty is quite to realise how best to bring home to people the truth in matters such as these. We have been so long accustomed to round assertions, evidently based upon fancy rather than on fact, that in treating a matter such as this, I myself feel as if I were exaggerating, and so hardly know how to deal with, or even justly to appreciate, the facts which crowd themselves upon the mind of any one who will take the trouble—the patient trouble—to inquire. Thus, in this supposed era of “no preaching,” I find that, taking only those who have left evidence in the shape of written collections of sermons, the names of at least 200 sermon writers are known to us as having lived and written in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Most of these, moreover, be it remarked, are Carmelites, the least numerous of the four Mendicant orders. Are we to suppose that this phenomenon is due to the fact that the Carmelites had in Bâle a capable bibliographer, or rather that, whilst the members of the order of Mount Carmel preached, the other Mendicants were all the time “dumb dogs?” On Mr. Lilly’s hypothesis this latter is the more probable alternative. For my own part I am inclined to think that the record of a vast mass of sermon literature of the two periods previous to the Reformation has perished, simply because the Franciscans and Dominicans, not to mention the other great orders, possessed no Bâle to register their sermon writers. Still less fortunate, of course, would be the secular clergy, who did not form a corporate body with corporate interests. Hence I would conclude that the list of preachers and sermon writers during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (given in, say, Pitts or Tanner) only contains a proportion—in fact, I may say a small portion—of those who actually lived in that period. Yet even this list contains a very respectable number of names.

It must be long before even a fair sketch of the history of preaching and instruction in England during the later Middle Ages can be drawn. Even in the British Museum alone it is

necessary to examine and weigh the contents of some hundreds of manuscript volumes. It is a case of which we may truly say *labor est ante nos*. But already one or two points of importance stand out clearly from a background of much that is yet vague. First and foremost, it is certainly untrue that religious instruction, in the highest sense of the word, was neglected in pre-Reformation England. Next to this is the prominence given to familiar instruction, as distinct from preaching, and the importance which in Catholic days was attached to the constant—the perpetual reiteration of the same lessons of faith and practice. It may be said that this must have produced a certain sense of sameness, and that education has altered matters in our own times. In point of fact, however, no amount of education really affects these truths, still less does it advance them. The only question is, how best the truths of religion are impressed upon the mind. I must own to a belief that at the present day our Catholic people have not that clear understanding nor that firm grasp of the great simple truths of their religion which they ought to have. Nor need we be astonished if this be the case: for is there much exaggeration in the statement that after leaving school Catholics now seldom receive regular and systematic instruction upon the elements of faith and practice during the rest of their lives? Here we are living in the midst of Protestants, and I would ask if, when the whole nation was Catholic and had been so for generations, when the very atmosphere which Englishmen breathed was impregnated with Catholicity, it was considered necessary never to cease repeating instructions of what, for lack of a better expression, I may call “the Penny Catechism type,” it can be safe in these days of vagueness and latitudinarianism to rely—I may say exclusively—for the teaching of our people on the formality of set sermons?

Of course I must be understood as not wishing unduly to obtrude these considerations; but in investigating the history of religion among the English people many doubts such as these force themselves on the attention of the inquirer, and many a practical question is raised in his mind of which at the outset he had no suspicion.

Science Notices.

The Duration of the Electric Spark.—Professor Boys in the course of his experiments in photographing flying bullets by the light of electric sparks, has had occasion to investigate the question of the time occupied by the appearance of the electric spark. This has been generally regarded as practically instantaneous, but the experiments of Professor Boys show that electric discharges, notwithstanding their comparative rapidity, have, like lightning flashes, their degrees of long and short, according to circumstances. They also show how the experimenter in this latest branch of so-called instantaneous photography can measure and even control the duration of the spark, adjusting its duration and intensity to a nicety. In these experiments Professor Boys again displays that power of simplification of apparatus which has so marked his past work—a power which, though inimical to the interests of the instrument-maker, is invaluable to the investigator. To find the duration of various sparks, Professor Boys makes use of the revolving mirror. The mirror he employs is made of hardened steel, and, worked by an electric motor, runs at the speed of 1000 turns a second. The light from any spark under examination is focussed by the mirror upon a photographic plate. If an electric spark were really instantaneous when the mirror is revolving, the image would be as clear and sharp as if the mirror were at rest, but all electric sparks when thus examined by the mirror in motion show an elongated band of light. At a recent lecture given by the Professor he made use of his mirror to focus a beam of light upon the screen. When he turned the mirror slowly, the spot of light was drawn out into a band reaching across the screen, and, as he stated, this is described over and over again as the mirror revolves. If the mirror is revolving once a second it can be shown that the spot of light is revolving 250 feet a second. If the mirror is revolving 1000 times as fast, the spot of light will traverse the screen 1000 times as fast also, which Professor Boys describes as a speed of about 250,000 feet a second, or 160,000 miles an hour—a speed 200 times as great as that of a Martini-Henry bullet. In Professor Boys' words, "It is not difficult, therefore, to observe how long a spark lasts when its image can be whirled along at such a speed as this." As one example of a photograph of the elongated band of a spark, Professor

Boys exhibited that of a spark made between magnesium terminals, by the discharge of a condenser of $2\frac{1}{2}$ square feet of window glass, the spark being one-eighth of an inch long. Below the band there is drawn a scale of millionths of a second. The Professor stated that if the spark had been instantaneous, it would have been seen as a fine vertical line. The line, however, is drawn sideways to an extent depending on the duration of the spark. A spark thus produced between magnesium terminals, though it is exceptionally brilliant owing to the presence of the metal magnesium, and thus in one way suited for photographic purposes, is, however, not suitable for photographing objects in exceeding rapid motion, such as flying bullets. The spark, except at the ends, lasts less than one millionth of a second, but the ends remain alight as long as six or seven millionths. Professor Boys has found it necessary in the case of his photographs of flying bullets to abolish the magnesium terminals, and in fact to avoid all easily volatilised metals, such as brass, which contains zinc, and to use beads of copper or platinum. The duration of the spark can be further reduced by diminishing the size of the condenser, though there is a limit beyond which this cannot be done, without lessening the light, and also by using broad and short bands of copper instead of wire for the discharge circuit. This increases the light. Professor Boys says that the best spark he has yet produced for instantaneous photographic purposes, is obtained from a condenser whose surface is one square foot. The bands of copper in the discharge circuit are two inches broad and about four inches long apiece. To ensure extra good contact between these copper bands and the tinfoil surface, there are long radiating tongues of copperfoil soldered to the end of the copper bands. The spark terminals are knobs of platinum, though copper seems to answer the purpose equally well as the former more expensive metal. The whole of the light is extinct in less than one millionth of a second, while the first blaze, which, as Professor Boys explains, is practically the whole spark, lasts less than ten millionths of a second. "It lasts so short a time that it bears the same relation to one second that one second bears to four months; or, again, a magazine rifle bullet travelling at the enormous speed that is now attained by the use of this weapon, cannot go more than one four-hundredth of an inch in this time." With such an electric spark the Professor has succeeded in obtaining a series of photographs of flying bullets which show the projectile on its course as sharply and clearly as if it was at complete rest, and also brings into view on the plate of the camera the curious and suggestive phenomena of atmospheric waves in front and behind the bullet.

The Lantern Stereoscope.—An inventor who could produce on a screen photographic pictures with the objects standing out in stereoscopic relief, so that a whole audience could see the effect, without the aid of a special appliance applied to individual eyes, would reap an easy fortune. But with our present knowledge of the laws of optics, such a result seems to be impossible. Mr. John Anderton has invented a lantern stereoscope, but, unfortunately for the commercial value of the invention, the stereoscopic effects of the pictures thrown on the screen are only visible when the spectator applies to his eyes a pair of tubes, in external appearance something like an opera-glass. Thus the practical application of the arrangement is limited. It could not be well used for a lecture, illustrated by lantern views, as it would be difficult to supply a large audience of perhaps a thousand persons with the necessary apparatus, and possibly the audience would weary of perpetually viewing the picture through the tubes. To obtain the effect, the slides used are those taken by a stereoscopic camera. The two images are superposed on the screen as nearly as possible. The light from each lens of the lantern is polarised, one beam in a vertical plane, the other in an horizontal plane, and the projection is viewed through a binocular analyser, consisting of two tubes, in each of which there is a plate of glass set at an angle to the line of vision. By means of this analyser, the right eye can only see the image portrayed in vertically polarised light, and the left eye can only see it in horizontally polarised light. Thus each eye only sees one of the stereoscopic views, and the two being thus conveyed to the brain separately, there is a stereoscopic effect.

Electric Railways.—The Heilmann Hundred-ton Electric Locomotive.—The City and South London Electric Railway, which at the time of its opening was described in this REVIEW, has now been working long enough for an estimate to be formed as to the financial efficiency of this system of locomotion for short railways. According to Dr. Edward Hopkinson, the experience gained in working this line has more than realised the anticipation of the contractors, who of all others might be expected to be most sanguine. When Messrs. Mather and Platt undertook the construction of the line they guaranteed that the cost of traction for a service of 8247 miles per week as actually run should not exceed 6·3d. per train mile, exclusive of the driver's wages. The actual cost comes out at 5·1d. per train mile. The generator station of this line produces electric energy at a cost of 1·56d. per Board of Trade unit, which is less

than the annual average cost of production of any electric station in England, if we except Bradford, where coal and labour are cheap. In its output it heads the list of any central station. In 1892 it delivered 1,250,000 Board of Trade units, the second on the list being the St. James's and Pall Mall with 1,186,826 units. The success of the enterprise has encouraged the construction of other short electric railways. Liverpool can now boast of its overhead railway, which has been lately constructed by Dr. Edward Hopkinson. This line appears to be meeting with the patronage of the public. The total number of passengers carried since the opening is 1,370,742, and the directors' report states that a contract has been entered into for the extension of the railway to Crosby Road, Seaforth. On all existing electric railways, with the single exception of the Buda-Pesth tramway, the uninsulated rails of the permanent way are made use of for the return current, but, as Dr. Edward Hopkinson has recently pointed out, it is doubtful whether such a system can be considered final, as it creates differences of potential in the earth, which have already produced disturbing effects in the instruments in observatories, and on telegraphs and telephones. He thinks with reason that probably legislation will have to step in to restrict the use of the earth for only the passage of the delicate currents used in the operations of telegraphy and telephony. Such disturbing effects are obviated by the use of an insulated return. Dr. Edward Hopkinson urges another argument in its favour. He maintains that the insulated rail is a danger to horses and other animals, many animals, and notably horses, being far more sensitive to electric currents than man. He gives it as a fact that a shock of 250 volts is quite sufficient to kill a horse almost instantaneously. This is considered a low voltage.

While in this country we are turning our attention to constructing electric railways for short distances only, and running our electric trains at such very moderate speeds as about 13 miles an hour, certain enterprising engineers on the Continent and in America are turning their attention to the possibility of long distance lines, and tremendous speeds that will eclipse anything accomplished by steam locomotives. They already anticipate that the speed of 150 or even 200 miles an hour may be realised. Experiments were recently made by Mr. G. Weems, at Laurel, U.S., on a circular line two miles in length, when a small cigar-shaped locomotive was used. The locomotive is said to have attained a speed of 116 miles an hour.

Amongst the various projects for long distance railways is one proposed by Dr. Wellington Adams, for a railway from St. Louis to Chicago (248 miles). The system projected is a high-speed motor

car, with two pairs of driving wheels 6 feet in diameter, weighing about 15 tons and capable of developing about 800 electrical horse-power. To work the line, high tension currents are proposed to be transmitted from central stations, 55 to 40 miles apart, by overhead conductors, to transformer stations, 10 miles apart, along the line, whence low tension currents are to be supplied to the motors of the cars by overhead wires. M. Zypernowsky has proposed another scheme for a line from Buda-Pesth to Vienna (150 miles), to be constructed on similar principles. Some engineers think that the existing railroads should be utilised for electric traction, instead of making new ones at enormous cost. It is estimated that the Buda-Pesth and Vienna line is to cost £80,000 per mile. But, as Dr. C. S. Du Riche Preller has recently pointed out in an instructive article in *Engineering*, the system of fixed conductors fed from central and transformer stations, and the speed of 160 miles per hour, are not adapted to ordinary railroads.

The points and crossings at junctions and intermediate stations, the comparatively short distances at which the protecting signals are placed, and the numerous level crossings alike would render the running at such speeds extremely dangerous; nor are the gradients, the curves, and the permanent way generally adapted for them; and again, in order to supplant steam locomotives on a given railway system, conductors would have to be placed, not only on the main-line, but also on all branches and sidings. All this would, therefore, require a total transformation of the existing lines, and a correspondingly enormous outlay of capital.

M. J. J. Heilmann, of Paris, is just completing an electrical locomotive which is shortly to be tried on the French State Railways. This has been designed to avoid the expense of making special railways, or that of altering existing ones, as it will dispense with all overhead or underground conductors and contact rails. In point of speed, M. Heilmann is not so ambitious as some of his contemporaries. He only promises that his engine will drive express trains at a speed of 60 or 70 miles an hour (maximum 100 miles), while at lower speeds it will be available as a powerful goods engine. At first sight this locomotive seems devoid of all principles of economy in the transformation of energy, for it carries with it the boiler and steam engine, the dynamo machine for working the motors, the exciting dynamo and its steam engine, and the motors, the whole machine weighing one hundred tons. But in practice it may be found that the waste in energy in the various stages of transformation may be compensated by other advantages; for instance, as Dr. Du Riche Preller points out, under some conditions of working the steam is used more uneconomically in an ordinary locomotive than in a well-designed engine employed in generating electric currents; for in-

stance, "in hauling a train up an incline, when the steam locomotive requiring its maximum tractive force at its minimum speed, has to work at maximum admission, the electrical locomotive can, on the other hand, develop its maximum electrical tractive force by simply increasing the speed of the generating steam engine (and hence of the dynamo) without increasing the normal admission of steam."

Then a point in its favour is that the whole weight of the locomotive is used for adhesion without the use of coupling rods. Another advantage would seem to be that every axle can be actuated independently of the others by its own motor. In this locomotive the continuous current is used, the dynamo being one constructed on the Brown system, having six poles and a gramme ring armature with cross connections. Its normal output at 360 revolutions a minute is 1025 ampères, at 400 volts or 410 kilowatts, equal to 560 effective horse-power, or 93 per cent. efficiency of the steam engine. The eight axle-wound continuous current motors have each four poles with only two bobbins. The armature is a gramme ring with Pacinotti teeth. The weight of the whole motor, mounted and complete, is 2·7 tons. It is mounted on a steel tube fitted to the wheel axle. Although this peculiar electrical locomotive does not promise the high speeds which other engineers are proposing, still on account of its easy adaptation to ordinary railways, the coming trials will excite keen interest. But whether or not it is destined eventually to supplant the steam locomotive on the French railways, it is likely that the latter highly perfected machine will die hard.

The Hydrophone.—At the soirée of the Royal Society, held last June, Captain McEvoy's hydrophone was exhibited. This instrument seems likely to prove an addition to the multiple scientific resources of modern warfare. It is an undoubted advantage for the commander of a fleet to be warned of the approach of a hostile man-of-war or torpedo boat when at a considerable distance. This information is given by the hydrophone. The instrument is a modification of Professor Hughes' microphone, which doubtless has many practical applications before it, besides its accepted use as a telephone transmitter. The arrangement is exceedingly simple. In a heavy cast-iron case there is a flat spring, fixed at one end and free at the other. A short piece of roughened platinum wire, guided in an easy-fitting hole, rests upon the free end. The apparatus is submerged some miles from the shore, and is in electrical communication with an indicator on the home fleet, or, as it may happen, on land. Owing to the sensitiveness of the spring to vibrations, it responds to the minutest disturbances.

When an electric current is sent through the metals in loose contact—viz., the spring and the platinum wire—and a telephone is also included in the circuit, there is a constant succession of sounds in the telephone. When the instrument is submerged under the sea it can detect the passage of a steamship within a mile. The indicator which Captain McEvoy has invented to act in conjunction with the hydrophone is called a kinescope. By means of this instrument the varying currents produced in the hydrophone set in action a bell or flash a light signal. In the telephonic circuit there is a delicate apparatus in which a finger index is acted upon by the current so that it takes a certain position. By then arranging two magnets, one on each side of it, the index finger is attracted to one side or the other under variations of the current. This action is utilised to work a relay, so that a bell or lamp, worked by a local battery, is set in action, and thus the approach of the hostile vessel is indicated.

The Recent Abnormal Dry Period.—The phenomenal weather which has attended this spring and early summer in the British Isles is a striking example of the truism that every rule has its exceptions. For a while the climate of some parts of the British Isles was completely changed. The ravaging east winds which usually accompany the advent of March were either absent, or when present, bereft of their malignant properties; and instead of the leaden skies which generally prevail at that time was brilliant insolation—even in London, where fogs have been for a while almost entirely banished. Many invalids left England at the end of February for the Riviera and other sunny stations of the South to escape from the proverbial English spring, and no sooner had they reached their destination than their friends reported to them that they also were enjoying exceptional sunshine. Spring passed into summer under the abnormal conditions of weather, and day after day was dry, warm, and bright. Mr. Douglas Archibald was lately addressing the Royal Meteorological Society on his impressions of the climate of Australia, where he had been making a long sojourn, and he compares the weather in London in the early summer to that which so largely prevails in certain parts of Australia, which he describes as dry and invigorating. But when a limited amount of rain fell after the first beginnings of the “break up,” the atmosphere in London became unbearably oppressive, and unprecedented temperatures were registered, so that even those who had most rejoiced in the exceptional season hailed the advent of the complete

termination of the drought. Some persons have only regarded the drought as a national disaster, on account of the undoubted mischief it has caused to the agricultural prospects. But periodic droughts no doubt play their part in the great economy of Nature. One benefit which may result from the drought may be the extermination of the influenza germ, though this is a matter of speculation. The epidemic has appeared over and over again in the British Isles, and the usual dampness of the climate seems favourable to its development and retention in the system; therefore an unusual period of dryness would seem to be an antidote against its influence, and if the drought has lessened the chances of a recurrence of the disease next winter, its visitation for a certain period should be a matter for thankfulness. But, whether this may be the case or not, there is no doubt that if the drought had been protracted much longer, the health of large towns would have suffered much in other ways, in being deprived of the natural cleansing by heavy summer rainfalls.

The principal features of the great drought have been very clearly set forth in a concise article in *Nature*. It points out that the drought has been one of wide extent, having affected nearly the whole of Europe, large portions of Canada, the United States, and other parts of the globe. Those parts that have not been visited by the drought have experienced exceptionally heavy rainfall. As regards the British Isles, as a whole, the drought may be said to have lasted fifteen weeks; was most severe in the south of England and felt least in the north of Scotland. "Over Scotland, England, and Ireland it increased in intensity, with pretty uniform regularity, from north to south. Thus the deficiency in percentages from the average rainfall of that portion of the year was 30 at Lairg, and 59 in Berwickshire; 59 at Penrith, and 70 at Dungeness and Falmouth; and 38 at Londonderry and 67 at Waterford." It seems that the least deficiency that was registered at any of the stations of the weekly weather report was 1 at Glencarron, in Ross-shire, where the amount of rainfall was 16.91 inches. The greatest was at Dungeness and Falmouth, being 0.60 at the former, and 0.94 at the latter. The deficiency in London was 0.77 inch. The type of weather which prevailed during the period was anti-cyclonic, attended by small satellite cyclones, with their consequent thunderstorms. A remarkable feature of some of the thunderstorms was that they were unaccompanied by rain. Some phenomenally high temperatures were registered during the period; as an example, there is quoted in the article referred to, the mean for London during March, April, and May. That was 40.3° above

the mean of the previous 130 years. Considering that during the present century there have only been about eight droughts that can be compared with that which has lately been experienced, and considering that the drought of the present year excels them all in length, being the longest on meteorological record, we need hardly fear its repetition at an early date.

Notes of Travel and Exploration.

Land System of Kashmir.—Mr. Knight's valuable book, "Where Three Empires Meet,"* is a reportory of information concerning the various countries he passed through. The first of these was Kashmir, and he places before us, perhaps more vividly than any previous traveller has done, not only the oft-described scenery of that country, but also the character and way of life of its inhabitants. As part of his tour was made in the company of Mr. Lawrence, the settlement officer, he saw much of the peasant class, who are all Mohammedans, while the royal family and ruling caste are Hindus, here called pundits, without necessarily possessing the attainments which the name implies elsewhere. The cultivators, being ground down to the uttermost by the rapacity and oppression of the officials, welcome with joy the British officers, civil and military, lent by the Government of India to the Durbar in order to carry out the reforms absolutely needed to save the country from bankruptcy. The abuses connected with the collection of the revenue resulted in the robbery of the State on the one hand, and in the oppression of the cultivators on the other, while some villages, favoured by the collusion of their head-men with the Government officials, escaped the payment of taxes almost altogether, as the assessment of the several districts was at the discretion of these authorities. A complicated system of embezzlement and falsification of accounts permits vast arrears of unpaid revenue to accumulate against these favoured districts, as to the existence of which the cultivator is reckless, since the State has practically no means of recovering them. Ejectment has no terrors for him, and is profitless to his creditor, while all his movable property, cattle, implements,

* London : Longmans. 1893.

and even crops are carried off to the mountains on the approach of the revenue collector. To extract a bare subsistence from his fields is the utmost goal of his ambition, since to accumulate property would be but to invite plunder. The reform of this system was no light task, and seems to have been performed by Mr. Lawrence with the even-handed justice which characterises British administration in India. As the fresh assessment carried out by him lasts for ten years, every device of Oriental cunning was resorted to in order to cut it down as low as possible. In one case, where the village in point of fact was assessed considerably below its value, the spokesman arrived carrying in one hand a lump of stone and some sand, and in the other a few mouldy straws, a handful of diseased rice, and some decayed walnuts as specimens of the soil and its products. The people assumed a correspondingly woebegone appearance, but as soon as they found that Mr. Lawrence was not to be imposed upon by their drama, their spirits returned, and they laughed and chatted merrily over the defeat of their champion. The result was that while arrears of revenue were blotted out, being in point of fact irrecoverable, an increased figure was fixed for the future, of which the regular payment would be insisted on. Over-lenienty in this respect is found to be a mistake, as the cultivators require a stimulus to labour to prevent them from letting the land deteriorate. The artificial irrigation of Kashmir, which renders it almost independent of rainfall, makes the question of water one no less fertile in causes of quarrel than that of land, and the farmers on the hills were accused of stealing the precious liquid from those on the plains.

The worst class of abuses were those connected with the *corvée* or *begar*, made a source of additional hardship by being used as an engine for levying blackmail on the entire population. Thus, when a dozen carpenters were required for Government work, every member of the trade in Srinagar was impressed, in order to extort ransom for their exemption. It is calculated that for every man actually taken for the State requirements, ten have to purchase immunity by bribes to the officials, sometimes to the amount of a hundred rupees. Yet the system cannot be abolished, as it is the only machinery available for necessary public works, such as roads and bridges. The needed reform consists in the equalization of its incidence, and the abrogation of its abuse for purposes of extortion. It is satisfactory to read of the confidence felt in Mr. Lawrence's settlement, and the increasing prosperity of the Sind Valley throughout which it has been effected. In many districts the farmers who had fled into India are flocking back to their original

homes, as many as twenty-three families having returned to one village within a twelvemonth.

No European is allowed to possess land in Kashmir, and as the number of Anglo-Indians who make it their summer resort, now about 300, has far outgrown the accommodation provided for them by the Maharaja, the visitors to Srinagar live either in boats on the river or in tents on its banks.

Scenery of the Happy Valley.—Mr. Knight seems to have found the Kashmirian landscape to justify even the Oriental hyperbole with which it is spoken of, and he describes one of its peculiar effects as follows :

Shortly after dawn, when the dew was still on the pastures, and a thin haze was in the air, a very curious and fairy-like scene lay before us. The whole plain was here overgrown with the small blue iris in full flower, presenting the appearance in the distance of a great still blue sea. Of exactly the same tint was the sky above us, and the lower portion of the mountain range on the far horizon where the snow was not lying. Thus plain and sky and hills were not distinguishable one from another. One seemed to be looking into an infinite pale blue space, cloven in the centre by a jagged band of pearly-white—the distant snowy uplands trembling in mirage. But one must have seen it to realise the unreal beauty of the picture.

Kashmirian Tibet.—The Western Himalayas, with an average height of over 17,000 feet, and rising in the peak of Nanga Parbat to 26,670 feet, divide the Kashmirian dominions into two portions, differing no less in climate and natural features than in the character of the races inhabiting them. This stupendous barrier, crossed most easily at its lowest depression, the Zoji La, or pass, 11,500 feet high, parts the Aryan from the Mongol, and the Buddhist from the Hindu. Ladak, conquered by its present rulers between 1834 and 1842, was previously ruled by a native raja recognising China as his paramount Power, and the Grand Lama at Lassa as his spiritual chief. The latter is still regarded by the inhabitants as their real sovereign. The Zoji Pass is rather the great step to the higher level of the Tibetan plateau, than a saddle between two ranges of mountains, the descent on the northern side being comparatively small. Hence it marks the transition from the green and wooded countries reached by the southern rains to the bleak Central Asian waste without dew or cloud, forest or pasture—"where one may march through a long summer's day and never see so much as a blade of grass"—a region always freezing or burning under the clear blue sky, where rocks exposed to the sun may be too hot to touch, while it is

freezing in the shade. Cultivation is carried on only by means of artificial canals bringing down the water from the upper snows to form tiny green oases, as sharply defined as though cut out of some other country and dropped into the midst of the surrounding desolation.

Tibetan Piety.—Among the mechanical forms of piety in use in Tibet is the *mani* or praying wall. Each of its stones being carved with a prayer or pious image is supposed to pray for the passers-by, lessening their term of probation and bringing them nearer to nirvana, provided they keep the wall on their right hand. A road consequently always divides in passing a *mani*, in order to let travellers in both directions profit by its powers. The carving is executed by monks who roam through the country to perform this pious office, and so diminish the sufferings of their fellow-creatures. A *mani* frequently terminates in a *chorten*, a species of large sarcophagus raised on a pedestal, containing the ashes of the dead kneaded up with clay, and made into idols, either several in the case of the poor, or a solitary one if the monument of a rich man. Sacred writings are inscribed on the face of the cliffs in the defiles passed by the road, in order to frighten away the evil spirits; and colossal idols are carved in relief on the rocks in other places. Praying flags, with pious legends, flutter in the breeze, and are no less efficacious than the praying wheels turned by the current of the streams, or held in the hands and incessantly kept in revolution. The approach to a Ladaki town or village is generally through an avenue some two or three miles long, lined with Buddhist monuments, thousands of *chortis*, groups of cairns, and long walls of carved prayers covering the otherwise desert ground.

Mr. Knight attended a very singular Buddhist celebration at the monastery of Himis, some twenty miles from Leh, the most important of these establishments in Ladak, with accommodation for about 800 monks and nuns. Here is held an annual mystery play, known as the Devil Dance, which lasts for two days, and to which pilgrims flock in numbers from Chinese as well as Kashmirian Tibet. The ceremonial, performed in the court of the monastery, consists of processions and dances of lamas, gorgeously attired, and wearing hideous masks; the religious object being to familiarize men with the demon shapes who will seek to terrify and lead them astray after death, in their search through space for their true sphere.

The Gilgit Road.—The strategic importance of the Kashmirian border is emphasised by the encroachments of Russia on the frozen steppes of the Pamirs, which have no value save as a stage on the road to India. Gilgit, the northernmost outpost of the British Empire in this direction, is consequently a point of supreme importance, from its command over the passes of the Hindu Khush, the roads from which all descend to the Gilgit river or its tributaries, as well as from its affording communication through Kashmirian territory with the outlying protected State of Chitral. Mr. Knight's pages give a vivid impression of the difficulty of reaching this watch-tower of India by the old road, liable in some places to be swept by land slides into the terrific gorges it traverses, and rendered impassable during the winter by snow blizzards on the two high mountain passes which divide it from the Valley of Kashmir, in attempting to force which hundreds of mules and their drivers are sometimes overwhelmed. The new road, 240 miles in length, constructed by Messrs. Spedding & Co., from the valley of the Jhelum to Gilgit, is therefore of inestimable military value in facilitating communication between the fort and its base. As the country through which it passes is practically a desert, all supplies and provisions for the 5000 navvies employed in its construction had to be brought up from the valley, rendering transport a very difficult and anxious question for the firm engaged in the enterprise. A strong hand, too, was needed to keep order in the camp, where men of the wild frontier tribes—Afridis, Khybaris, Peshawaris, Kabulis, Kashmiris, Swats, and Punjabis—were gathered together, in many cases outlaws and fugitives from justice in their own countries. A much easier route through the Indus Valley to Abotabad will eventually be opened up, as soon as the savage tribes—Chillas, Shinakas, and others—occupying a territory hitherto marked as unexplored on the map have been sufficiently subdued. The dangerous Kashmir passes will then be avoided, and Gilgit brought ten days nearer to the Punjab railway system. The extension of the Gilgit road through Yasin to Chitral is now advocated, so as to bring that State, into which a Russian force recently penetrated, more directly under British control. The key of the western Hindu Khush would then be in British keeping, and an army advancing from Herat would be outflanked by a force in the lower Chitral Valley.

The Hunza-Nagar Confederacy.—A very singular state of society is that described by Mr. Knight as existing among the two

little robber clans occupying the almost impregnable defile of the Kanjut Valley, and defeated by the British expedition under Colonel Durand in November and December 1891. The author was not only present during the operations, but took an active part in them, all civilians on the spot being invited to volunteer as officers, while the Pathan navvies were armed and embodied as an auxiliary corps. The two miniature States, which, though nominally tributary to Kashmir, had successfully defied its authority, occupy respectively the opposite sides of a ravine, with a torrent, whose precipitous banks can only be scaled at certain points, forming the frontier between them. Hunza and Nagar, their rival capitals, frown at each other across the gorge in a perennial state of mutual hostility, while leagued together against the outer world. Though unable to put more than 5000 fighting men in the field, these freebooters of the mountains were the terror of their neighbours from Afghanistan to Yarkand, living by organised brigandage on the plunder of the caravans between India and Central Asia, especially those from Leh to Yarkand over the Karakoram Pass. The inaccessibility of their valley secured them impunity, wedged in as it is between some of the highest mountains in the world : Mount Rakapshi, towering to a height of 25,560 feet, above neighbouring peaks over 24,000 feet high, while the Naga River rises in the most gigantic of known glaciers, covering hundreds of square miles. Each little community was ruled by an absolute despot, who sold or slew his subjects as his fancy dictated. The Thum, or King, of Hunza, who succeeded in 1886 by the murder of his father and two of his brothers, boasts descent from Alexander the Great, and was generally credited with the possession of magical powers, such as that of summoning hurricane, snow, and frost to do his bidding by flinging a piece of ox-hide into a certain stream. A magic drum, too, suspended on the topmost tower of Hunza Castle, was beaten by fairy hands when he was about to engage in a successful war. The defences of the Kanjut Valley consisted of a formidable series of forts and breastworks, occupying the precipitous sides of the gullies intersecting it, so placed as to command the approach, not only by musketry fire, but also by couloirs, down which rocks could be hurled on the assailants.

The admirable skill and daring with which these obstacles were surmounted by the little British force, some 1200 strong, forms a fascinating chapter in Mr. Knight's volume, nor does he omit to do justice to the military instinct of the Kashmiri Sepoy, Nagdu, to whose scouting the success of the expedition at its most critical point was due. One of the strangest features of the campaign was the heartiness with which the population, after its stubborn defence,

accepted British rule once it was found to be inevitable, overjoyed apparently at being delivered from the tyranny of their native sovereign. They made bridges for the invaders, and pulled down their forts to use the rafters as firewood for them, declaring that they were no longer wanted, as the English would protect them. The advanced party were presented with offerings indicative of submission by deputations from the various villages, one of which derived a fantastic aspect from the scarlet dye with which the beards of the old men composing it were stained. The inhabitants live in villages enclosed by strong towered walls, within which they retire at night from their fields and gardens. Every terrace and step of soil is cultivated, and each thread of glacier stream utilised for irrigation, so that orchards of peaches, apricots, apples, and mulberries, alternating with other trees festooned with vines, are wedged in among the cliffs.

Result of the Campaign.—The native dynasties of Hunza and Nagar have been re-instated in the persons of their least objectionable representatives, owing allegiance to the Empress-Queen, whose flag has thus been carried right up to the glaciers of the Hindu Khush. Caravan raiding and slave stealing have been prohibited, and one of the principal trade routes to Central Asia is thus rendered secure. The consolidation of frontier defensive communication is still progressing, and the Chilas country being now held, the direct road through it to Gilgit has been surveyed and improved, avoiding the dangerous eastern passes. Three regiments, each 600 strong, remain on the frontier, with the headquarters at Gilgit, and detachments in Hunza and Nagar. Another regiment will hold the passage of the Indus at Boonji, the most important point on the road in the rear of Gilgit; while a political officer, responsible for the entire district, will probably have his personal guard of fifty men raised to double that strength.

The Great Lake of Siam.—French demands on Siam have called attention to the geography of one of the districts in dispute, that of the Great Lake of Foule Sape, half of which is in Cambodian territory, and half bordered by the Siamese provinces of Ang-Kor and Battambong: a tall mast projecting from the water marking the boundary between the Siamese and Cambodian dominions. This fine sheet of water, about sixty miles in length, with an area of a thousand square miles, is enclosed by shores covered with luxuriant

vegetation, beyond which mountain peaks rise to a great height. The fish with which it swarms are a cause of prosperity to the adjacent population, and a source of considerable revenue to the State. Nor is man alone in his depredations on them, for myriads of waterfowl wheel above the lake or float on it, while flocks of pelicans wade from the banks, and aigrettes with snow-white plumage crowd the branches of the trees near its edge. Native legend affirms that here, as in the case of many great lakes, the waters roll over what was once a fertile plain with a thriving city in its midst. The lake is fed in the rainy season by one of the branches of the Mekong, and is then navigable by large steamers, which go to Siemreap at its northern extremity. The city of Battambong lies about three days' march thence, on a small river navigable for small boats, though so narrow that they are almost touched by the branches of the trees on either hand. The houses on the shores are surrounded by luxuriant plantations of bananas and mangroves, with wide rice-fields in their rear. Pony races and cock and tortoise fighting are the prevailing sport in Battambong, whose inhabitants share the gambling spirit common to all Siamese. The town, although nominally protected by a fortified earthwork on the high ground above the river, would be incapable of offering any resistance to a French force.

Ancient Remains in Ang-Kor.—The province of Ang-Kor takes its name from the ancient capital of Cambodia, situated to the north-east of the lake in the midst of a rich plain surrounded by mountains. The gigantic ruins which mark its site are all that is left of one of the most famous dynasties of the East, that of Khmer, which ruled for centuries over the empire of Cambodia, with a hundred and twenty kings as vassals, an army of five million men, and a treasury of fabulous riches. The ruins discovered by the Portuguese and Spaniards in 1564 had been known to the Chinese some centuries earlier, and their accounts of them had been transmitted to Europe in the thirteenth century. The investigations of modern French *savants* have fully confirmed these older descriptions, and a valuable work on the subject has been published by M. Fournereau. Ang-Kor Wat, the royal pagoda, is said by M. Moudot, who visited it in 1862, to be more majestic than any monument of antiquity still preserved to us. The park in which it stood was 1087 miles long and 827 broad, while over this area were strewn buildings of the most fantastic design and colossal size, towers, temples, terraces, colonnades and galleries, avenues and bridges, decorated with vast figures of monstrous and grotesque animals, and with carvings and pictures on the

great blocks of which the structures are composed. The great height to which some of these blocks have been carried would be a difficulty to modern engineering, believed to have been surmounted here by means of inclined planes. Ang-Kor Thom, at a few miles distance, is still more ancient, and a vast mass of ruins overgrown by giant banian trees, rooted among their foundations, here marks the site of Preathong, the former Khmer capital. The bas-reliefs preserved among the underground galleries of these ruins are especially interesting, as they commemorate the pastimes, ceremonies, and history of a lost civilisation. Hundreds of minor groups of monumental remains are scattered over a large area, where they are barely traceable beneath the vegetation that has entombed them; and the ruins of Bassette, among others, are supposed to be those of the ancient Summer Palace of these once mighty sovereigns. New Ang-Kor, an insignificant town, is situated about fifteen miles north-east of the lake, and represents in its inferiority the gulf between the ancient and the modern importance of this region. The province of Battambong has been incorporated in the kingdom of Siam only about one hundred years, from which time the present town dates. The inhabitants are mostly Cambodians, and have several times attempted to rebel. They still preserve the usages and manners of their own country, and are leniently dealt with by Siam in the way of taxation.

The Mekong.—The great river of Indo-China, now created the frontier between Siam and the French possessions in the East, was first systematically explored in 1866 by the expedition of Garnier and Liguree. From its source in Tibet, 1500 miles from its delta, it traverses Yunnan and the Siamese Shan States by a course so rocky as to be impracticable for navigation until it reaches Luang Prabang, the straggling capital of the State of the same name. In this village of bamboo huts, with a few brick temples interspersed, is held a daily market described as the most important of that region with the exception of that of Zimmé. The unhealthiness of the spot, where fever attacks natives and Europeans indiscriminately, does not interfere with the mirth and gaiety of its inhabitants. Music is universally heard, and the streets are promenaded in the evening by the women singing in chorus. A small quantity of gold is obtained by washing the sands of the river, and an image of Buddha, three feet high, has been made from it. The women wear a profusion of gold ornaments, which are dyed red, on the annual recurrence of their principal festivals, by boiling them in various

solutions, of which the last is a mixture of salt, sulphur, and tamarind. The journey from Luang Prabang to Bangkok is usually reckoned at twenty-six days; elephants and carriers being the means of transport employed. The river below the town winds between black vertical walls of rock, and but few villages are seen on its banks, until the Laos towns are reached with their comparative commercial activity. It is here navigable for boats as far as Kemmerat, where it ceases to be so for 160 kilomètres, until it reaches Pakmun, and receives its principal tributary the Simun, which flows through populous districts, but by a course broken by rapids like the steps of a flight of stairs. The main river is navigable below the junction for a stretch of 150 kilomètres, when it is interrupted by the rapids of Khong for a distance of some ten miles. There are altogether six of these stretches of broken water, cutting off the different reaches of the river from intercommunication, and rendering it impracticable as a trade route. The population along its banks is scanty throughout the greater part of its course, and the French dream of making it the outlet for the land-locked provinces of southern China seems impossible of realisation. In its lower course through Cambodia, its banks are strewn with the ruins of the ancient Khmer kingdom, so full of interest to the historian and archæologist.

Siamese Temples.—An interesting account of the temples of Bangkok is given in *The Globe* of August 8th, by a naval officer who contributes his recollections of that city. The Wat Chang, or Great Temple, is reached by a flight of steps leading from the river, from which a large inner court is entered. Along its sides are ranged 250 large gilt images of Buddha, identical in size and expression, with numerous grotesque figures in front of them, while the gate is guarded by a pair of giants 30 feet high, with hideous faces and boar's tusks. Within the temple the principal object is a gigantic Buddha, 40 feet in height, amid a number of other stone images, the mural decorations consisting of scenes painted in curious perspective. Behind the figure of Buddha is the sacred fire, supposed to have been originally sent down from heaven, which has been kept alight for centuries, and is used for setting fire to funeral pyres; a more especially sacred flame being reserved for royal use. In front of the image promiscuous gifts, such as clocks and alabaster vases, are piled up, together with bundles of fragrant sticks used for burning in funeral ceremonies. The principal tower is a huge structure about 200 feet high, with a base 100 feet square, covered externally with

ornamentation formed of pieces of glazed pottery stuck on with mortar in fanciful patterns and devices. A platform half-way up affords a fine view of the city, the greater part of whose population of some 400,000 live in boats or floating houses on rafts.

The King's Temple, where the court annually meets to renew the oath of allegiance to the monarch, who reclines on a couch in front of an image of Buddha, is near the Palace, and close to the stables of the sacred, though mangey-looking, white elephants. The principal Buddha has an immense emerald in his chin, and a great diamond in his forehead, and is surrounded by lesser Buddhas in solid gold. The altar is flanked by trees, those on the right with golden, and on the left with silver, leaves. The building is a parallelogram, 200 feet in length by 100 feet in breadth, with a roof resting on a row of pillars. The walls are richly decorated with carving and gilding, and the doors handsomely inlaid with black and yellow woods and mother-of-pearl. The principal religious ceremonies next to funerals are those which take place on the cutting off of the hair of the children, which is worn in a top-knot until they reach the age of eleven or twelve, and then shaved.

Notes on Foreign Periodicals.

GERMANY.

BY CANON BELLESHEIM, OF AACHEN.

Katholik.—Professor Gutberlet, the editor of the *Philosophische Jahrbuch*, contributes two excellent articles on St. Thomas Aquinas and Kant. Not a few philosophers of our age are raising the war-cry, "Return to Kant," totally regardless of the fact that the poverty which has befallen modern speculative thought has its very source in the system of Kant. On the other hand, Leo XIII. and all Catholic philosophers have combined to bring into prominence the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. Professor Gutberlet directs his inquiry into the several departments of philosophy, contrasting the two systems of St. Thomas and Kant. He evidently shows that, apart from some minor shortcomings, the former has brought out a philosophical system fully in harmony with the nature and faculties of the human mind, and in addition to this one which is borne out by daily experience and the facts of history.

What Professor Gutberlet mainly insists upon are the ideas of Kant on God, morality, and religion. He unanswerably proves that whilst they aim at upsetting every religion whatever, St. Thomas's philosophy works towards the highest development of the human mind. Canon Stöchl Eichstätt deals with the practical topic, "Modern Liberalism and its Atheistical Character." As applied to religion, liberalism becomes the source of indifferentism; bearing on morals, it is productive of independent morality; influencing science, it generates that so-called free research which generally, in course of time, opposes itself to supernatural revelation, and thereby to Christianity. On the other hand, he maintains that liberalism in religion does not less banefully affect the family, the school, and the spirit of benevolence, and thus deprive them of their Christian character, while it evokes the system of civil marriage, school boards, and State rates for the poor.

Fr. Gurber has a series of useful articles on Comte's religion of humanity. These contributions of the learned Jesuit remind us of his larger treatises on Comte's system which were noticed in this REVIEW, July 1893, p. 721. F. Eubel, of the Friar Minors Penitentiary at St. Peter's, Rome, gives a sketch of the Life of Matthew Döring, a member of his order in the fifteenth century, distinguished for literary pursuits, but unfortunately impressed by the false theory of the superiority of General Councils over the Pope, sentiments to which he gave acrimonious expression in the Council of Basle. Abbé Paulus, residing in Munich, has set before himself the task of recording those leaders of Catholic literature in the period of the Reformation, who nowadays are all but forgotten. The present article is devoted to the labours of John Mensing, of the Dominican Order. A very high recommendation is accorded to the "Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles," recently published by Dr. Felten, formerly professor of theology in the Episcopal Seminary of Leeds, now at the University of Bonn. The bulky volume of 486 pages treats thoroughly all questions which arise from the text, and favourably impresses the reader by the author's evident familiarity with English exegetical literature.

Historisch-politische Blätter.—For the July issue the writer contributed an article on the sixth volume of Professor Lehmann's work, "Preussen und die Katholische Kirche seit 1640" (Leipzig, 1893). The present number claims our peculiar attention from the hitherto unpublished documents referring to disputes of the Rhenish Electors and Archbishops with Pius VI., concerning the admission

of Papal Nuncios in the German Empire. In addition to them we learn that Pius VI. more than once asked two Prussian Kings to help him in checking the efforts of the three Archbishops manifestly tending to undermine the unity of the Church.

Another contribution deals with Fr. Rösler's biography of Cardinal Dominici, of the Dominican Order (Herder, Freiburg). Originally the author's intention was to write the life of St. Antoninus of Florence. Whilst ransacking for this purpose the archives of Florence, Fr. Rösler soon became conscious that he never could duly attain his object without previously studying the life of Dominici, the spiritual father of Antoninus. The accurate researches of Fr. Rösler in Italian libraries go to reflect the highest credit on Cardinal Dominici as a member of his order, a powerful preacher, a successful reformer, and indefatigable supporter of Gregory XII. In addition, we become acquainted with his opinion on the Renaissance movement, the more dangerous tendencies of which he soon detected and sought to oppose. A very commendatory notice is given of Professor Gutberlet's recent valuable works, "Ethick und Religion," and "Die Willensfreiheit und ihre Gegner."

To Fr. Zimmermann, of Ditton Hall, we are indebted for his able articles on Dr. Brosch's "History of England, 1603-1688," and Bishop Wordsworth's "Annals of my Life, 1847-1856." Other notices refer to Orby Shipley's "Carmina Mariana" and the "Paléographie Musicale of the Benedictine Fathers of Solesmes."

"Stimmen aus Maria Laach."—Fr. Granderath writes two able articles on the idea of Christ's reign as developed in the writings of the late Professor Albrecht Ritschl of Göttingen. The learned professor, who is held to be one of the most prominent supporters of that peculiar theology commonly called "Vermittelungs Theologie," denies the institution of a hierarchy by Christ, and lastly dissolves the church in a union of individuals equally possessed of the same rights. Fr. Kreiten describes Pascal's closing years. Fr. Arndt treats the relations between Russia and Constantinople in the fifteenth century. Fr. Zimmerman adds an interesting notice on Wilfred Ward's recent work on the life of his father, Dr. Ward, after his reception into the Catholic Church.

Lastly, we may solicit the attention of English scholars for the article contributed to the "Historisches Jahrbuch" (München, Herder), 1893, p. 582-603, by Professor Kirsch on Andreas Sapiti, who acted in Avignon under John XXII. and Benedict XII., as proctor for Edward II., and the English and Irish bishops. From

the documents printed for the first time we learn the complaints made against the Irish laid before the Pope, A.D. 1325, their causes, and the means by which they might be remedied. Next come the taxes which some Irish bishops, through Sapiti, in 1325 and 1332, paid to the Camera Apostolica.

FRANCE.

Revue des Questions Historiques. Juillet, 1893. Paris.

The Chronology of the Books of Esdras and Nehemias.—

Under this heading, Father C. Huyghe, S.J., opens the July number of the *Revue*. The traditional chronology of these two books has been warmly discussed of late; Father Huyghe cites the novel opinions of three or four French critics. A learned professor of Louvain, M. Van Hoonacker, has written (in articles in the *Muséon* of 1890 and 1892, of which *tirés à part* have been published) a powerful defence of the traditional chronology so far as regards the arrival of Nehemias at Jerusalem, which he shows must have been in 445 B.C., under Artaxerxes I. Even M. Kuenen has acknowledged the talent of this defence, though he refuses to admit M. Hoonacker's conclusion. The Louvain professor, however, in the course of his defence has admitted one novel contention of certain innovating critics—Messieurs Havet and Imbert—namely, that Esdras came to Jerusalem in 398 B.C., the seventh year of Artaxerxes II., and *not* in 458 B.C., the seventh of Artaxerxes I. as the common and accepted chronology had previously been. The present writer, Father Huyghe, comes forward in defence of the older and recognised system, and in particular of the traditional date of the arrival of Esdras against the above concession by M. Van Hoonacker. The long article is too technical and minute in the accumulated details to admit of brief analysis. Students interested in the subject will scarcely be content with anything less than a study of the article, and probably of the literature there referred to.

The Life of St. Paul the Hermit and the Chronology of Metaphrastes.—This second article is also from the pen of a learned Jesuit, Father Hippolyte Delahaye, one of the Bollandist editors, if we mistake not. A comparison of the very brief account of Saint Paul, in Butler (December 20), and the highly interesting matter occupying the thirty-five pages of this article will give an idea of how much, in many cases, has been gained to hagiography by modern

literary research. The abundant references will enable a student to follow up still further the path of progress. Father Delahaye has some interesting remarks on the literary style and the ability with which the original Greek (of the tenth century) life of St. Paul is written, contrasting favourably with the "compilations maladroites et sans style" of so many of similar productions of Latin writers of the Middle Ages. The Byzantine writer, he remarks, not only uses a rich and harmonious language with ability, but he has a mastery over his subject, arranges its parts, and devotes his attention to them according to their value for his purpose; there is sequence and variety of matter and manner; facts are distinguished from reflections and are naturally associated.

Probably this was what Butler meant in his pithy way when he concludes his brief account of this Saint with: "See his life, which is well wrote." This edifying and graceful biography is the work of a contemporary, but the author of it is really unknown. Some valuable MSS. discovered, apparently by chance, early in this century, at Mount Latros itself, dating from the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, help to throw light on the value and authorship of this contemporary Life of S. Paul; and a Russian *savant*, M. Vasilievsky, who among others has published more fragments of them,* and indulges in the speculation that the anonymous Biography of S. Paul is the work of Simeon Metaphrastes. Father Delahaye devotes a portion of his article to a discussion of this suggestion: and concludes that though the biography may be, no serious argument yet justifies in concluding that it is, the work of Metaphrastes; numerous internal indications show that the Biography was written by an inhabitant of the monastery of Mount Latros.

Monastic and Hermitical Life in the East.—The article contains some very interesting details on the subject of the Cenobites and Hermits of the East about the tenth century, and their manner of life, which show some striking differences from the monastic manners of the West. The alternations of solitude (often at great distances) with returns for longer or shorter periods to community life and common routine, are noteworthy. S. Paul himself, as a young man with a strong attraction for solitude, obeys one superior who checks his desires and keeps him at home, and after that superior's death gets the consent of another to depart. With a companion he exiles himself, by a journey of many days, and for some eight months apparently

* In the *Russian Journal of Public Instruction*, 1880, pp. 379-437, Father Martinov, S.J., has made a French translation.

the two live from all other human association apart. Then a letter from their superior brought to them promptly brings them home again: and so on. The article also has some interesting suggestions as to the life of the "Stylites"—of whom there were so many. There was often more room on the "pillar" than one might think. S. Paul himself took to this form of life: and his "pillar" was the table-like top of a rock which stood sheer up like a pilaster from the hillside, but whose top was flanked by a cave or grotto in the hill. The narrow top was not easily climbed up to. This narrow home, perched on the high rock—the eagle's rest, rather than man's—was already sanctified by a residence of twenty years on it of one Athanasius, before it was pointed out to our Saint.

The Eastern Solitaries and Holy Communion.—This interesting question, on which Father Dalgairns once wrote, has some little light thrown on it by our Saint's Biography.

One day he was seized with an ardent desire to assist at the holy sacrifice, in his (elevated and nearly inaccessible) grotto. How were others to reach him? His friend Athanasius, at his request, fastened a ladder to the rock, and by means of it a priest and a few monks ascended. Mass was said, and those present communicated, whilst a miraculous trembling shook the rock. Another time, Mass was said for our Saint, in a cave equally inaccessible on the isle of Samos and in circumstances still more extraordinary; which shows (says our author) that not even what we should regard as insurmountable obstacles could prevent those ancients from participating in the holy mysteries.

The next article in the *Revue* is from the pen of M. de Boislisle, and begins a narration, from new studies, of the story of Scarron and Françoise D'Aubignè, later on the famous Madame de Maintenon: then follows a long article, full enough of curious detail, on "Fabre d'Eglantine, Comedian, Dramatist, and Revolutionist," and one might add, worthless lover, unfaithful husband, and hard-hearted father. The article is by M. Victor Fournel.

Among the minor articles of this number one is worth mentioning, by Father Ch. de Smedt, S.J., headed, "L'Ordre Hospitalier du Saint Esprit." It gives a eulogistic account of a monograph on that order by the Abbé P. Brune (published at Lone-le-Saunier, 1892, 452 pages 8vo), which Father de Smedt calls "une véritable révélation historique." The history of this once wide-spread order is now, for the first time, clearly traced. What few extracts Father de Smedt gives us point to the Abbé Brune's work as one of the most interesting possible of its kind. He traces the methods of charity in the Church in the thirteenth century, and then sketches

the aims of this order, which contained both brethren and sisters. Gui de Montpellier must have had the heart of a S. Vincent de Paul. The new institute embraced every variety of charitable work : "the sick, orphans, abandoned children, the poor, old people, lying-in women, Magdalens, pilgrims, and travellers—every class of the necessitous found a welcome in their houses." The Grand Master of the Order, who was never a priest, resided in the chief house, which was the Hospital of S. Maria *in Saxia*, at Rome. By the sixteenth century the order, which was highly developed in France, had spread to Spain and Portugal, to Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, and England. The Abbé Brune has established the fact that the Order of the Holy Ghost had never a military character: it comprised brothers and sisters for works of charity, some priests and clerks for spiritual functions, and *oblates* of two kinds, children offered by their parents to be brought up in religion, and adults who joined in the work of the order either permanently or for a period. Two things have struck us in reading this attractive article: the Grand Master had to sleep and live with the others, and if he committed a fault he was put on fasting diet of bread and water, with a guard of three clerks to see he kept to it!—that promises well. Yet, alas, *prosperity*, material prosperity, destroyed in time all fair promises, and led to decay and extinction.

Notices of Books.

A CORRECTION.

Apologetics, or Christianity Defensively Stated. By Professor A. B. BRUCE. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark.

OUR attention has been called to the fact that the review of the above work, which appeared in our last number, has seriously misrepresented the doctrinal position and scope of the author. We regret that our reviewer has been led into the error of implying, upon the strength of two passages which he cited, that Professor Bruce doubted or denied the Virgin Birth of our Lord, and the Sinlessness which is the necessary sequel of belief in our Lord's Divinity. We are glad to find that the passages on which our reviewer has relied for such a judgment represent, not Professor Bruce's own views, but, on the contrary, the statement of opinions which he is engaged in refuting. It is, therefore, quite true to say that instead of calling in question either the Virgin Birth or Sinlessness of Christ, Professor Bruce's work is an earnest and sympathetic defence of both.

The whole line of argument adopted abundantly removes the imputation, and appears to us to establish beyond reasonable doubt the nature of the author's convictions. At the same time, we owe it to sincerity to say that we are unable at times to associate ourselves with what seems to us the halting phraseology which Professor Bruce has seen fit to employ *in facie inimici* when dealing with the question of the Divinity of Christ. To say that Christ has for the Christian consciousness "the religious value of God," or that St. Paul ascribed to Christ "a Divine Sonship involving, at least, ethical identity with God," are formulæ capable of a perfectly orthodox construction. But not the less, although it may be but a matter of taste or style, they have a decidedly unsatisfactory ring in the ears of those who are wont to affirm with St. Peter, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God"; and unhappily they leave room for plentiful evasion in the minds of those who are content to look upon Christ as a sort of mere religious or ethical counter for the Divinity. When Professor Bruce further proceeds to consider the position of those who in the future may regard with dislike the definitions of the ancient Councils as to Christ's twofold nature and single Personality, and warns us that such an attitude

is not to be mistaken for a denial of Christ's Divinity, and tells us that it may be a mood of mind "compatible with an attitude of heart towards Jesus in full sympathy with the faith of the Catholic Church concerning Him, even in the most orthodox generations," we confess that such language seems to us a contradiction in terms. The orthodox, in the theological and historical sense of the term, are those who sincerely receive and believe the definitions of the Catholic Church in her General Councils, and not those who regard them with "coldness and aversion"—dispositions which in any honest and candid mind must be equivalent to doubt and denial. Professor Bruce can hardly believe that any mere attitude of heart, which sets at nought the decisions of the Church, can make Nestorianism or Eutychianism into Catholicity. The Divinity of Christ, which he is defending, distinctly involves the truth of the Incarnation. No one needs to prove the Divinity of *God*, and when we apply the word Divinity to Christ we obviously mean that God was made man. Now, it is precisely this truth that was voided by the heresies of Nestorius and of Eutyches. If, as the latter contended, there was *not* a twofold nature, there could be no real Incarnation, for Incarnation postulates two terms; and if Eutyches were right, either the Word or the Flesh was wanting. On the other hand, if Christ were, as the teaching of Nestorius maintained, a composite term, implying a merely moral union or partnership of *two* persons, one Divine and the other human, it would clearly follow that the Person who died on the cross was not the same Person as God the Son. As Christ is He who died for us, such a doctrine undermines the Atonement, and is certainly tantamount, in our belief, to a denial of Christ's Divinity. The very definitions of Nicaea, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, which according to Professor Bruce may be regarded with coldness and aversion—viz., tacit denial—without incurring the charge of denying Christ's Divinity, are to us the absolutely necessary postulates and safeguards of the truth of that Divinity of Christ and of the fact of the Incarnation; and that so much so, that any unwillingness to accept them logically betrays the existence of a latent doubt or disbelief of both these doctrines in the mind which exhibits the symptoms of "coldness and aversion." Such certainly is the diagnosis upon which is based the judgment and action of the Catholic Church in the past, the present, and the future. Having thus risked the ungraciousness of pointing out the many and important considerations upon which the author's standpoint differs very markedly from our own, we hasten to add that that is a reason not the less, but the more, why we profoundly regret that any misrepresentation of

the aim and spirit of his work should have found its way into our pages. While we do not believe in any practical prescinding of what are termed the fundamental truths of religion from the rest of integral and full-orbed Catholic Christianity—for God's word is to be taken for little things as well as for great—it must ever give us much more real pleasure to welcome and commend, than to disparage, even by a word, the excellent apologetic services which are rendered from time to time outside the pale of the Church to the defence of the primary Christian dogmas.

We trust that it may serve to emphasise the correction which we gladly make, and to remove the impression which our former notice may have left on the mind of some of our readers, if we cite the following passage, in which Professor Bruce lucidly deals with the test truth of our Lord's resurrection (p. 397) :

The result of the foregoing inquiry is that all naturalistic attempts to explain away the resurrection up to this date have turned out to be failures. The physical resurrection remains. It remains, it need not be added, a great mystery. Much that relates to this august event is enveloped in mystery.

And :

In the resurrection of Jesus two processes seem to have been combined into one—the revivification of the crucified body, and its transformation into a spiritual body endowed with an eternal form of existence; the first process being merely a means to an end, the actual, if not indispensable, condition of the second.

Many such passages might be easily culled from its pages. The whole structure of the work is based upon a profound belief in the divine character of Christianity, and is animated throughout by a sincere zeal for its defence against the assaults of scepticism and infidelity.

THE EDITOR.

The Blessed Virgin in the Fathers of the First Six Centuries.

By Rev. T. LIVIUS, M.A., C.S.S.R. With a Preface by H.E. the CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. 8vo, pp. 481. London : Burns & Oates. New York : Benziger Bros.

THE issue of this valuable work happily synchronises with the year which has witnessed the solemn re-dedication of England to Our Lady. Fr. Livius could hardly have laid at the feet of Our Blessed Patroness a more fitting tribute than to have placed side by side with the work of his fellow-Redemptorist on the "Dowry of Mary" this volume, in which we hear the combined voices of the Fathers of the first six centuries united in speaking the praise of the Mother of God. In a coming number of this REVIEW we hope to deal with this

work more at length, and with the fulness which its importance deserves, but in the meantime we must be content to welcome it as a most useful addition to our Catholic literature, and to bespeak it a cordial reception from all who have the honour of Mary at heart, and love to learn how the children of the Church in their earliest not less than in their latest generations have "called her Blessed."

The Century Dictionary. An Encyclopedic Lexicon of the English Language. Prepared under the superintendence of WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Comparative Philology and Sanskrit in Yale University. In six vols. Vol. VI., STRUB—ZYX. New York: The Century Co. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

WE have already expressed our very high opinion of the merits of the "Century" Dictionary when noticing former volumes. We have now received the sixth and completing volume, and congratulate the enterprising publishers on the uniform excellence of printing and engraving, and the wonderful celerity with which they have carried through a task of enormous magnitude. The six volumes of the "Century" form, indeed, a monumental work, marking in composition and editorship the latest results of philological science, and in its artistic features the most advanced results of typography and engraving. Indeed the illustrations, which are so often in works of this kind merely reprints of such blocks as could be easily procured, have been prepared for the "Century" with great care and artistic excellence—those on natural history subjects, especially profuse in quantity and of marvellous delicacy of line and finish in printing, would, if transferred to a well-written volume on that special subject, make a book to delight a student's heart. We have before adverted to the efforts made by the editors of this Dictionary to secure accuracy in technical definitions and explanations, and to the fact that they had submitted topics of Catholic interest to the revision of a well-known priest in New York. We have reason to be satisfied that this fair treatment has been continued to the end. Take for example the word Vulgate, where, within the space of some twenty lines, a great deal of valuable information is wonderfully condensed. Condensation, indeed, in the "Century" Dictionary has been carried to a degree of great ability. Another admirable instance of it is the article Te Deum; and others, those on Telegraph, Telescope, Temple, &c. When we say that the completed work extends to 7046 quarto pages, printed

in three columns, which gives a total of over 21,000 columns, the magnitude of the work will be understood. The sixth volume concludes with an appendix on the proposed reforms (!) in English spelling of the American Philological Association, which one might almost fancy to be a joke, but for the solemn assurance that our conservatism is only the result of "stubborn prejudice," which later on becomes "ignorance and prejudice." We are told (in the new phonetic way) that "an alterd orthografy wil be unavoidably offensiv to those who ar first calld upon to uze it." On which we only observe (adopting the same new mode) that "the meer site of it to our ey is as fysic to our stumac," and we rejoice that the general adoption of it is not likely to be in this century nor in our own day, and that the editors of the "Century" were not advanced enough to adopt it in their excellent Dictionary.

BIOGRAPHIES BY MRS. HOPE.

Early Martyrs. By Mrs. HOPE. Sixth edition.

Life of St. Philip Neri. By Mrs. HOPE. Fourth edition.

Life of St. Thomas à Becket. By Mrs. HOPE. Third edition. Revised and corrected from the Author's notes, with Memoir of the Author.

Franciscan Martyrs in England. By Mrs. HOPE. Second edition. London : Burns & Oates. 1891.

IT is many years now, somewhere between thirty and forty, since the first-named of these volumes was given to the public by Mrs. Hope. F. Faber styled it, on its first appearance, "a very fascinating book," a verdict fully borne out by the fact of its being now reprinted for the seventh time. The "Life of St. Philip Neri," though projected and commenced in the June of 1855, owing to delay caused by the ill-health of the authoress, was not actually published till 1859. It was undertaken at the request of Father Dalgairns to meet the needs of those who frequented the London and Birmingham Oratories. It was to be short and not very learned, yet, of all the four volumes here noticed, it probably cost the authoress most time and trouble. Writing in 1855, shortly after she had entered on her task, she says : "Several points in St. Philip's character and vocation have been puzzling me sadly. I cannot tell you how difficult it is to write his Life. My way of writing a biography is to put myself in imagination in the place of my hero. But how can I put myself into the place of a Saint whom a modern historian has called a 'Thaumaturgus ?'" The reception, however,

which the work met with was exceedingly favourable, and it now reaches its fourth edition. Almost ten years elapsed before the "Life of St. Thomas à Becket" followed upon that of "St. Philip." It appeared in 1868, and a special feature and merit in it was, as the biographical sketch prefixed to this third and revised edition tells us, that "it placed popularly before the public the result of deep research as regards the causes of the martyrdom." The sketch here referred to, extending to some twenty-five pages, is mainly composed from materials furnished by Sir Theodore Hope, K.S.C.I., C.I.E., the latter part being from the pen of one of the most intimate friends of the authoress, Mgr. Brownlow, V.G. It forms an addition to the present series, which will be interesting to many who have long been acquainted with the works themselves.

After another decade the life of England's great Martyr-Bishop was followed by "Franciscan Martyrs in England," a work compiled from original sources, and perhaps in some respects the most attractive of the volumes under review. To compare or to contrast in detail the attractions and merits, whether historical or literary, of the respective volumes, would take us beyond the bounds allowed us here. We congratulate Messrs. Burns & Oates upon their republication of the series, and we trust that its "popular" character will ensure it a continuance of the popularity it has so far enjoyed.

Introduction à la vie Spirituelle par des Exercices disposés pour la Méditation et la Lecture, par le R. P. JACQUES MASENIUS, S.J. Par l'Abbé Z. C. JOURDAIN. Paris: H. Walzer, Libraire Editeur, 7 Rue de Mezières. 1892.

THIS work, which has just appeared, is a series of meditations on the plan of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, the author being a member of that society. It was first written in Latin by Father Masenius in 1651, under the title, "Dux viae per exercitia spiritualia communia omnibus, et propria ecclesiasticis." After going through several editions the author again brought it out in an enlarged and revised form in 1666, varying the title into "Dux viae ad vitam puram piam perfectam, per exercitia spiritualia meditationi simul et lectioni accommodatus: juxta normam sacrorum exercitorum D. Ignatii de Loyola formatus." It is a rather bulky volume of nine hundred pages, and has four divisions. The first gives the rules and methods of meditation as practised in the Jesuit order, and with considerable detail. The second develops the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius, and comprises thirty-three meditations, each affording abundant matter for one hour's reflection.

The third deals with the choice of a state of life, and contains six chapters, while the fourth has eight meditations, suitable for ecclesiastics solely. As to its relative value with the many developments of the spiritual exercises that have appeared from time to time, it would be difficult to speak with certainty, and that must be left to the advanced and disinterested ascetic. The type and paper are excellent, and, taking everything into account, the work bids fair to advance souls in the spiritual life, and to remunerate in point of demand the laborious undertaking of the translator. We sincerely wish it success.

Méditations a l'usage des élèves des grands Séminaires et des prêtres. Par L. BRANCHEREAU, Supérieur du Grand Séminaire d'Orléans. Deuxième Edition, revue et augmentée. Paris : Vic et Amat, Editeurs, 11 Rue Cassette. 1891.

WE welcome this new course of meditations from the pen of the distinguished and saintly Superior of the Seminary of Orleans. It consists of four volumes, upwards of 500 pages each, embracing every subject connected with the ecclesiastical life, and is written for students and priests, principally for the latter. The subject-matter comes to us in the following order:—The Attributes of God, Sin, the Four Last Things, Grace, the Virtues, the Exercises (Meditation, Mass, Retreat, &c.), the Sundays, Principal Feasts, the Passion of our Lord, the Feasts of our Blessed Lady, of the Saints, and, lastly, the Ecclesiastical State. Each meditation has three divisions, headed respectively Adoration, Consideration, and Resolutions. The first contemplates what our Lord did or taught touching the subject in hand, and examines it in Him as in a divine mirror. The second treats of it theologically and scripturally, and is subdivided into three parts, corresponding with which, in the third division, are three resolutions, with a spiritual bouquet from the Scriptures, or from some of the masters of the spiritual life. The meditations are suited in point of length for three-quarters of an hour, or for the entire hour, and are preceded by a *sommaire* or synopsis intended for the preceding night. The style is simple, clear, and elegant, and presents no difficulty to those possessed of an ordinary knowledge of French, whilst the paper and type are everything that could be desired.

In these meditations the pious ecclesiastic will find his conceptions of the Divine Attributes undergo a wonderful expansion, and in what follows he will have abundant solid matter for mental and practical instruction. The object of meditation being to complete

our union with Jesus Christ, we have no hesitation in affirming that this excellent work, taking into account the admitted learning and sanctity of the distinguished author, will be a path of light and of consolation to the zealous hardworking priest. J. M.

L'Allemagne et la Réforme. Vol. III. L'Allemagne depuis la fin de la Révolution sociale jusqu'à la Paix d'Augsburg (1525-1555). Par JEAN JANSSEN. Traduit de l'Allemand, sur la quinzième édition, par E. PARIS. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit & Cie.

THREE has been some delay in the appearance of this third volume of the French translation of Janssen's history of the German people, of which we noticed the first volume in 1888, and the second in the following year. We learn that this volume was in part ready when the learned author died (December 24, 1891), and the French editor gives us as an introduction a fairly full and very acceptable biographical sketch of Janssen's life and labours. It is interesting to note the promise of the future scholar and historian in the young boy, who learned his first lessons from his earnest-minded father, whilst he imbibed, it is said, a certain quiet and tender piety and deep faith largely from his charming mother, whom the lad lost when he was only thirteen. Then came the question of the boy's career, and his father discouraged his more literary aspirations, and practically enough ruled that a trade ought to be learned. And so it came about that young Janssen was apprenticed to a blacksmith in his native place: a prosaic start truly for a youth of genius. It is to his credit that he tried to do his duty, though the fascinations of the muse of history terribly distracted his mind at times. His master seems to have divined that the lad was not intended for the anvil, and a clerical relative, more strongly impressed with the same conviction, stepped in and brought about a happy change to college.

It was in Janssen's case, as so often—his great intellectual gifts had to be exercised the greater part of his life in despite of delicate health and frequent suffering. This is part explanation of his comparatively early death; he was not much over sixty, having been born in 1829. We learn that this French translation of his *magnum opus* had Janssen's warm sympathies and the benefit of some supervision from him. There remains a good half of the work yet to come; we can only trust that the remaining volumes will be translated with equal care and completeness. The French edition, it is pleasant to state, gives the valuable notes of the original, and each

of the volumes has its own indexes (of names and places), of immense service. The title-page sufficiently indicates the period covered by this third volume. The sanguinary and sad details of the Peasants' War of 1525 closed the second volume. This one takes up the story with the condition of the people at this time and carries the protracted account of efforts at pacification, which really meant the attempt of each side to keep or to gain its own, through Diets and endless debates, until the so-called "Peace" of Augsburg. The mass of details brought together with marvellous patience by Janssen need to be steadily read through if we are to understand how completely the Reformation in Germany also was a revolution of worldliness, pride, and some of the worst passions against authority. Against the principle of authority, for the Papacy was not the only form of it which suffered ; though from the nature of the case a spiritual and religious power was the more irritating form of it to turbulent minds, and could defend itself least efficiently against their unscrupulous determination. It is the great triumph of Dr. Janssen's history that it has shown, and shown, manifestly from contemporary testimony, how little the Catholic Church deserved either the cry against her or the treatment she received, and that what needed remedy could have found it in legitimate procedure.

Les Psaumes Commentés d'après la Vulgate et l'Hébreu.

Par L. Cl. FILLION, prêtre de S. Sulpice, professeur d'Écriture Sainte au Grand Séminaire de Lyon. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. 1893.

WE are prepared by the Abbé Fillion's former volumes of Biblical Commentary (notably his excellent volumes on each of the Evangelists in M. Lethielleux's large work, "The Bible, with Commentaries") to expect from him a really good work on the Psalms. We are not disappointed. The Abbé deals with the literal interpretation : leaving aside the symbolical, and not even permitting himself any of the devotional reflections which might be expected, and would have been so easy. In this he has been doubtless wise ; and those will readily agree with him who already use the Psalter in their great daily duty of devotion—the recitation of the Breviary. It is a very great recommendation of the volume to say that the Abbé has produced as nearly exhaustive a literal commentary as any but professional students will require. When mystical interpretations—he remarks in his preface—are not founded on the literal sense, they are often forced, and frequently become frivolous or even erroneous : whilst they flow from the literal sense, spontaneously

and sweetly. To establish this literal interpretation the author avails himself of all the best exegetical aids, ancient and modern—both English and German modern writers of all shades have been steadily consulted by him. He gives the text of each psalm in the Latin and in a French translation, then discusses its authorship, the circumstance in which it was written, the subject and logical sequence of its ideas; and then follow notes on each verse, in succession, the Hebrew text being referred to constantly wherever it offers interesting difference or explains the Latin. We should also mention that the Latin and French texts are given by the author according to the rules of “parallelism,” or arrangement characteristic of Hebrew verse. This speaks to the eye, and is in truth, he remarks, the only exact and true method. As a test specimen of the author’s treatment no better example could be cited, perhaps, than the long Psalm cxviii. He has some preliminary remarks on the variety of words used for the Law of God, and their shades of difference, and gives Delitzsch’s “headings” of each division of eight verses—finally, however, giving a fuller heading of his own, which will give a character to each group of eight verses and do much to lend meaning and charm to their daily repetition at Office. Abbé Fillion’s volume will in respect of other psalms also be found a help towards their intelligent and pious use—*psallam spiritu, psallam et mente* (1 Cor. xiv. 15).

Words of Wisdom from the Scriptures: a Concordance of the Sapiential Books. Prepared from the French. Edited by the Rev. JOHN J. BELL. With a Preface by the Very Rev. A. MAGNIEN, S.S., D.D. New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers.

THE “Sapiential Books” of the Old Testament are *Proverbs*, *Ecclesiastes*, *The Canticle of Canticles*, *Wisdom*, and *Ecclesiasticus*. These five writings are all alike quoted in the Roman Missal as “Books of Wisdom.” Of the first three the writer was Solomon himself; the other two are sometimes ascribed to him, but were not written by him. The French writer from whom this compilation is translated, has had the idea of arranging the “wisdom” of these sacred books under classified headings, for the use of preachers and others. We have the Duties of man towards God, Duties of man towards himself, Duties of man towards his neighbour, and Social Duties. The division is not a very efficient one; for instance, under the “Duties of man towards himself” the writer has to get in a great many sayings which are rather ethical principles than “duties”; whilst there are double chapters on such subjects as

No. 8 of Fourth Series.]

3 Q

“prudence,” which is considered first as a duty to one’s self and next as a social duty. The inevitable effect of isolating the sayings of Scripture from their context is to lead to certain dimness of comprehension. This does not matter so much in *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiasticus*, but the magnificent reasonings of the book of *Wisdom* do not fail to suffer. The utility of the work, however, is self-evident. The texts are all given in full—not merely referred to—and in our Douay version. No citation is made from the *Canticle of Canticles*.

Breviarum Romanum. In duabus partibus. Editio Sexta Post Typicam. Ratisbonæ, Neo-eboraci et Cincinnati: F. Pustet. London: Burns & Oates. 1893. 8vo, xci–1048 (496)–xxxix–1012 (484).

Idem. In quatuor partibus. Editio quinta post typicam. xxxvi–436, xxxvi–404, xxxviii–364, lxxxiii–356.

WE are indebted to the well-known firm of Pustet for a new edition of the Roman Breviary, which we feel sure will be much appreciated by all who recite the daily Offices of the Church. The present edition, unlike most others in use, is in *two* handy volumes of convenient size. Though each comprises about 1600 pages, yet the paper is so thin (without being transparent) that the bulk is scarcely observable. The type is clear, black, and well-cut, so that it is easy and pleasant to read, and—what is of still greater importance in this age of new Offices—it is up to date, and all the recent additions to the book are in their proper places. The English supplement forms an appendix at the end of each volume; but the supplement is not quite up to date, since neither the Office of B. J. Fisher, *prima die libera post 22 Junii*, nor that of B. T. More, *prima die libera post 6 Julii*, is to be found in it. The edition in the four usual parts presents the same good qualities of paper and type in a more portable form. We can safely recommend it to any one intending to purchase a new Office book.

J. S. V.

Life of Father John Curtis, of the Society of Jesus. By the Author of “Tyborne.” &c. Revised by Father EDWARD PURBRICK, S.J. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THE name of Father John Curtis is already held in reverence and esteem in the country which was the scene of his long life of labours for God and his fellow-men. The biography before us will

give it, we feel sure, a wider circle of acquaintance, and will cause his light to shine in countries other than his own.

The career of Father Curtis, as the authoress tells us in her opening lines, was not one of striking incidents. His life was uneventful in the commonly accepted sense of the word. The career of a Rector of a College, of a Superior of a Missionary Residence, even of a Provincial of the Society of Jesus, comprises for the most part but a homely round of details. It is seldom that it runs out of the common groove. Yet we venture to assert that those who take up this biography will be interested by it, and will find in it something not merely to rouse their admiration, but to enkindle their sympathies, and, it may be, to stir them to emulation. They will meet in the kindly-hearted Rector of Tullabeg, in the fatherly Superior of Upper Gardiner Street, in the director of a missionary district of Dublin embracing every grade of society, one whose sympathies and whose devotedness were as wide-stretching as the multitude of souls that came within his reach—one who knew the way to reach the hearts of men, and how to draw them onwards in the path to a better life.

The secret of his influence with souls lay, as with all apostolic men, primarily and principally in the depth of his own interior life, in the likeness of his heart to that of the Divine Master of hearts. God found his soul a vessel empty, open, purified for the inpouring of His grace, and therefore He chose it as a "vessel of election," as a channel through which to pour His grace into the hearts of others of His children. Joined with this supernatural source of influence, or rather underlying it as the foundation on which his spiritual character was laid, there were in Father Curtis those natural qualities which go to make a man a power amongst his fellow-men. In him were blended tenderness with strength, delicacy and intensity of feeling with good sense, prudence and tact. But, what is more than these, he was possessed of that all-powerful gift of throwing himself into the thoughts, the feelings, the needs, the very aims and aspirations of other men, and, as it were by some magnetic force, of communicating to the spirit of his weaker brethren something of the life, force, and generosity of his own. The letters which his penitents wrote concerning him, after he was taken from their midst, give perhaps the most faithful portrait of what men found in him. One writes of him :

You could not fail to see at once that the sweet compassionate Heart of Jesus seemed to live in him. He saw virtue and goodness in every fellow-creature, no matter how wretched they might be (p. 58).

Another testifies :

He could say very hard things to me, and did too, but somehow one could not feel hurt. He was the one perfect person I ever met; his patience was inexhaustible. He was my staff and support in trials more bitter than death itself. When ill, he came directly to my bedside; when broken-hearted, he comforted me; and I feel that now in heaven he watches over me. I pray to him every day. I cannot yet realise that he is gone, and that I have not his wise head, kind heart, and true counsel to rely on. The blank even his letters have left! They were like rays of sunshine to us, who lead very lonely lives (*Ibid.*).

Another secret of the power of Father Curtis with souls was his devotion to the Apostleship of Prayer, of which he was an ardent promoter, and for some time the Central Director in Ireland. To him it served as the best and surest means of kindling in others the flame which burnt in his own apostolic breast. Space does not allow us to quote from the ardent words in which he urges this devotion. Reluctantly also must we leave unopened the rich treasures which are laid up in the many extracts the authoress has given from Father Curtis' letters to his relations, acquaintances, and friends in the religious life. Religious of every class, from the cloistered Carmelite to the ubiquitous Sister of Charity, from the Poor Clare to the Sister of Mercy, Nuns of the Sacred Heart, Christian Brothers, and, above all, the Ursulines, who counted so many of his own relations in their ranks, sought his counsel and profited by his advice. Those whose care it is to train up souls in holy religion, to educate the minds and hearts of the young, or to guide souls in the mazy paths of life in the world, will find in such fragments of Father Curtis' letters as are scattered throughout this biography a storehouse of new things and old. In conclusion, we need only say that the style of composition is light and easy throughout, and that the letterpress leaves nothing to be desired. We trust that this weightier volume will meet with the popularity which has so deservedly been accorded to the lighter works of the authoress of "Tyborne."

Der Masorah text des Koheleths kritisch Untersucht. Von SEBASTIAN EURINGER, priester der diocese Augsburg. Commissionsverlag der J. C. Hinrichschen buchhandlung. Leipzig. 1890.

IN this little work, containing nearly two hundred pages, Fr. Euringer has given us a critical examination of the Hebrew text of "Koheleth" (Ecclesiastes). A short introductory notice serves to inform the reader that the critical examination on which the author has entered, and which is now known by the name of textual criticism, tends to restore, as far as this is possible, the

Massoretic text to its original purity. Textual criticism, therefore, is widely different from what is commonly called literary or Biblical criticism, of which the end is to discuss the questions concerning the authorship and unity of our sacred books. Fr. Euringer further remarks that, to his knowledge, no book of the Hebrew Bible has as yet been submitted to a critical and scientifical examination of its text, and that his work on "Koheleth" is the first performance of textual criticism. In making this remark Fr. Euringer was mistaken; for at the same time that Fr. Euringer's book on "Koheleth" appeared, Professor Driver of Oxford published his critical notes on the Massoretic text of the two books of Samuel. We could not help noticing that both critics differ as to the spelling of the word Massorah. While Fr. Euringer, following the custom of his countrymen, writes Masorah, Professor Driver of Oxford has adopted the Jewish tradition of spelling Massorah. As we cannot find any reason why we should deviate on this point from the tradition of the Jews, we give preference to Professor Driver's way of spelling Massorah. In the Lexicon by Lemans and Mulder we are told that according to Kimchi the samech of the word טָבְרָה should be written with dagesch forte to denote that the aleph of the root טְבָר (to bind) has fallen away.

The reason why amongst other books "Koheleth" has been chosen by Fr. Euringer, is the new hypothesis of Professor Bichell concerning this book. Professor Bichell, Fr. Euringer tells us, maintains that the present order in which the ideas follow each other, and which no doubt is very imperfect and incoherent, is not the one intended by the author of "Koheleth," but the result of a misfortune which has happened to the MSS. from which, as from a common source, the Alexandrine version as well as our Hebrew text have been derived. In these MSS., which Professor Bichell supposes to have consisted of four sheets, each sheet containing eight leaves, a pitiable confusion or mixing up of pages occurred by some unknown incident. To make again these MSS. intelligible, and to take away, at least apparently, the absolute incoherence of ideas into which this direful confusion of leaves had ended, a series of changes, additions, and interpolations became necessary. The present state of our "Koheleth" is that which was effected by this restoration of the original text. Starting from this hypothesis, Professor Bichell ingeniously tries to recover from under the present condition of the book the true plan which the author himself had followed in putting forth and developing his ideas. This task, which Professor Bichell thinks to have accomplished, compelled him, as may be expected, to make many changes in the present text. In

his little work on "Koheleth," Fr. Euringer, who opposes this "Unfalls hypothese," wishes to ascertain what text corrections are called forth and justified by purely scientifical reasons. In connection with Professor Bichell's hypothesis, Fr. Euringer puts the question whether such a theory can be sustained from a theological point of view. Before answering this question he informs us that, like Professor Bichell, he does not consider "Koheleth" as "a mere collection of diverse sentences put together without order—a general judgment passed on all that is under the sun." He is, however, also willing to concede that commentators until now have failed in trying to point out its true object, plan, and division. He therefore agrees with Delitzsch, who says that "alle Versuche, in dem Ganzen nicht nur eine Einheit des Geistes, sondern auch genetischen Fortgang alles beherschenden Plan und organische Gliederung nachzuweisen, mussten bisher scheitern."

Fr. Euringer then proceeds to lay down the rule by which he will test the orthodoxy of Professor Bichell's hypothesis: "If the main thought, and the divinely intended contents of our book, in its present form, are identical with those of the text after it has been reconstructed by Professor Bichell, it is possible that God should have permitted such a mixing of the text to take place; for in this case the contents have remained the same. That the *Inspiratio* or *Assistentia Dei* only affects the contents of the sacred books, is a general theological opinion. If, on the other hand, the contents of our text are different from those of Professor Bichell's text, then is his hypothesis untenable, because it necessarily leads to the denial of the *Assistentia Dei* with regard to tradition." This rule Fr. Euringer then applies on Professor Bichell's theory. For, though he will not take unto himself the right of judging, he considers it lawful to state his opinion. Professor Bichell, we are told, though he succeeded, in a most ingenious manner, in constructing out of the canonical text a logical philosophical treatise on the value of life, has not in a full and exhaustive manner given back the contents of "Koheleth." "Koheleth," Fr. Euringer admits, argues on the value of life, but not exclusively. The hypothesis, therefore, of Professor Bichell appears to him, in the present case, inadmissible from a dogmatic point of view.

We abstain from examining the application which Fr. Euringer has made of his *Regula*, and we will restrict ourselves to discuss in few words the intrinsic value of his rule itself; not doubting that he allows us the right, which he has allowed to himself, of stating an opinion.

In the first place, we confess ourselves unable to follow the logic of the manner in which Fr. Euringer proceeds. In his *Regula* he

says that, unless the fundamental thought or contents of "Koheleth" are identical with those of Professor Bichell's text, his hypothesis cannot be admitted. How did Fr. Euringer, we feel inclined to ask, so suddenly succeed in determining, with a sufficient certainty, the fundamental thought or contents of our canonical text, while a few lines above the *object, plan, and division* of the book were pronounced to be a mystery not yet solved? Must we then conclude that for Fr. Euringer these three points are of no consideration at all to determine with certainty the main thought of a book?

In the second place, we think that the principle on which Fr. Euringer's *Regula* seems to be based, though very true in itself, is in the present instance entirely misleading: "Whatever necessarily leads to deny the *Assistentia Dei* with regard to tradition must be false." This, if we are not mistaken, is the principle from which Fr. Euringer proceeds. Now we fail to see that the hypothesis of Professor Bichell in any way leads to deny even a part of the *Assistentia Dei* with regard to tradition. It is a well-known fact that some of the inspired writings have entirely been lost. If an inspired book can perish without causing thereby anything incompatible with the Divine assistance in tradition, *a fortiori* the leaves of a sacred book can by some misfortune become mixed, with the result that the sense of it is obscured and its contents are somewhat altered.

Fr. Euringer has also devoted a few pages to a short discussion on the value and the authority of the different MSS. and versions which he uses in his subsequent examination. Though his remarks are clear and scientific, on the whole they are too short and do not sufficiently enter into details. For instance, we had expected to find a few words on Lucian's recension of the LXX., the text of which critics believe they have discovered in some of the later MSS. As Professor Driver tells us that Lucian's recension was a considerable help to him in his criticism on the books of Samuel, we should have liked to know whether it has the same importance, or even any importance at all, for the critical examination of the text of "Koheleth." Fr. Euringer himself laments the want of independence which the four codices **N**, A, B, C, betray with regard to the Hexapla of Origen.

Of his examination of the text itself we have taken but a short survey. Fr. Euringer, we readily concede, has performed his task in a thoroughly scientific manner. For assistance he used Professor Delitzsch's *Commentary*, whose opinion, he says, he adopts in all etymological and grammatical questions. We regret, however, very much that Fr. Euringer has not placed at the side of his critical observations a short paraphrase elucidating the literal sense of the text. Such an explanation would both have been easy to the author

and have occupied but little space; it would, moreover, show the practical results of the author's critical investigations, and would have doubled the value of his work, which is now only a book of reference.

C. V. B.

Histoire du Cardinal Pitra, Bénédictin de la Congrégation de France (Abbaye de Solesmes). Par le R. P. Dom FERNAND CABROL, Prieur de Solesmes. Paris: Victor Retaux et Fils. 1893. 8vo, xx—432 pages.

FATHER CABROL, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Catholic University of Angers, in the above book sets forth the life of a prelate who by his vast erudition, his numberless learned works, and by the splendour of his virtues as a Benedictine monk and a bishop has adorned the Church both in France and in Italy. The biographer has made a diligent use not only of Cardinal Pitra's printed works, the list of which occupies not less than ten pages (389—399), but also of his manuscripts and correspondence. Born on August 1, 1812, at Champforgeuil, diocese of Autun, Pitra in the due time became a secular priest. In 1842 he joined the Benedictines in Solesmes, under Abbot Guéranger. Whilst yet professor in the seminary at Autun, Pitra, with unwearied zeal and remarkable success, devoted himself to classical studies, which in 1841 bore fruit in the publication of his "Études sur une inscription grèque trouvée à Autun." We may readily appreciate the far-reaching importance of these studies when we remember that the inscription referred to the *Iχθύς*, the well-known cryptogram for Our Lord in the ancient Christian symbolism. From that time the department of Christian science and literature, in which Pitra was destined to serve the Church, became clearly marked out for him. At the suggestion of Abbot Guéranger, to whom he was associated by a lifelong friendship, and for whom, even after his elevation to the purple, he bore the affection and veneration of a son, in 1863 Dom Pitra delivered lectures in the Abbey on the "Écriture sainte dans l'Église Catholique," and on "L'Église Romaine et la sainte Bible." We next meet with Pitra in Paris, where he became Superior of the newly founded but short-lived Benedictine Priory. During the embarrassments and difficulties which followed the appearance of Dom Guéranger's first volume of "Institutions liturgiques," Pitra strongly supported the Abbot. At the same time, in the *Journal des villes et campagnes*, he contributed a series of weighty articles, reminding the defenders of the Gallican liturgy of some principles of canon law which they have all but totally left out of sight. Veuillot,

Lacordaire, Le Hir, Mgr. Parisis, Balmes, and Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, Head-master of Harrow, were frequent visitors at Pitra's house in Paris. As a result of his acquaintance with Dr. Wordsworth, Dom Pitra visited England in 1845. The biography contains several interesting letters descriptive of Oxford life in those days, and also the account of a visit paid to John Henry Newman in Littlemore. After his return to France, Dom Pitra wrote his "Vie de St. Léger," a model of hagiography, and one which elicited praise even in those quarters where, as a rule, the lives of the Saints are not unduly appreciated. To minor writings on the Bollandists and Catholic Holland, Dom Pitra, from 1852 to 1888, added the "Spicilegium Solesmense" and the "Analecta parata Spicilegio-Sol," the last volume of which made its appearance after his death. Volume the first possesses a peculiar interest for English scholars, exhibiting, as it does, the researches made by the indefatigable Benedictine in the principal libraries and archives of England. It was in 1859 that Cardinal Reisach, to whose virtues and learning the late lamented Cardinal Manning, in his famous history of the Vatican Council, has borne eloquent witness, read some articles contributed by Dom Pitra to the *Univers* on Rhalli's and Potli's (Athens, 1852) collection of Greek canonical laws, and warmly recommended him to Pius IX. Being summoned to Rome, he proceeded, with the approval of the Pope, to Russia. Supported by Count Montebello, the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg, he for several months made a thorough examination of the libraries in the capital and in Moscow. After his elevation to the purple, Dom Pitra brought out the results of these researches in the two volumes "Juris ecclesiastici graecorum historia et monumenta," in which he clearly and unanswerably set forth the important action of the Popes on behalf of the Greek Church. Wholly devoting himself to his studies on ancient Christian literature, but not less active in the work of the Roman Congregations, Cardinal Pitra in 1869 became first Prefect of the Vatican Library. After the Vatican Council he became Bishop of Frascati, and in 1884 Bishop of Porto. Whilst discharging with exemplary faithfulness the duties of a bishop, he nevertheless was able to find opportunity for continuing his Spicilegium. We congratulate the author for his attractive biography of one of the first scholars of the century, whose learning is only eclipsed by the solidity of his virtues.

A. BELLESHEIM.

Histoire de mon Temps : Mémoires du Chancelier Pasquier.

Publiées par M. LE DUC D'AUDIFFRET-PASQUIER. Première Partie: Révolution—Consulat—Empire. Tome i., 1789—1810, pp. 536. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1893.

THE Chancellor Pasquier, the first volume of whose memoirs has just been published, was born while Louis XV. was king, and lived till well into the latter half of the reign of Napoleon III. Sprung from a family of lawyers, he was already a member of the old Parliament of Paris when the Revolution broke out. His sympathies were at first all in favour of the popular party, but the excesses of the mob at the taking of the Bastille and during the bloody days of October converted him into an enthusiastic Royalist. At the king's trial he and his father, who was an intimate friend of M. de Malesherbes, did their utmost to save their master; and young Pasquier was present at the closing scene on the memorable 21st of January. Both father and son were cast into prison as members of the old Parliament. The elder perished on the scaffold during the Terror; the younger owed his preservation to the downfall of the arch-tyrant, Robespierre. For the next ten years Pasquier managed to live in comparative peace, though he remained faithful to the Bourbon cause. At length, however, when Napoleon had been crowned by Pius VII. and had returned in triumph after Austerlitz, the former Parliamentarian judged that any further opposition to the new *régime* was hopeless. At his own request he was appointed an official of the *Conseil d'État*, lately established by the Emperor, and later on became Prefect of Police, a post which he held at the close of the period described in this first volume of his memoirs.

It will be seen that, so far at least, Pasquier played no very prominent part in the great events which he witnessed. The interest of his memoirs arises chiefly from the fact that he was in an admirable position to see and hear what was going on, and that he possessed a keen insight into character and above all a just appreciation of the forces at work around him. He modestly declines to draw anything like a picture of the bloody scenes of the Revolution or of the marvellous victories of the Grand Army. He just notes the main facts; he sketches the leading men with a few vivid strokes, only now and then giving us a finished portrait. He is at his best when he recounts the sound advice which he gave in the Council, and when he makes his wise reflections on the course which events took. The latter part of chap. ii. (pp. 41—50), in which he sums up the causes and results of the Revolution, is worthy of Edmund Burke

himself. He insists that it was not so much the misery of France, but her prosperity, which led to the upheaval; that is to say, the condition of the *tiers état* had so greatly improved that they refused to submit any longer to a feeble king and a corrupt Court. Another striking portion of the memoirs is that dealing with the abortive National Council summoned by Napoleon in 1811. Pasquier does not conceal his entire disapproval of the Emperor's attempt to yoke the Church to his triumphal car. It is noteworthy that his two weakest adversaries, those humanly speaking least capable of resistance, contributed most to his downfall. Nothing was easier than to seize the person of the venerable Pontiff and to overrun Spain; but these two flagrant acts of injustice aroused the indignation of all right-minded men, and convinced the Great Powers that there could be no peace with the despot who perpetrated them.

Any one who reads the first volume of Pasquier's memoirs will eagerly look forward to the appearance of those which are to follow.

T. B. SCANNELL.

Précis Historique de l'Affaire du Panama. Par AUG. LUCAS.
8vo, pp. 250. Paris: Delhomme et Briguet. 1892. (2 fr.
50 c.)

THIS handy little volume contains a clear and concise account of the miserable Panama scandal. How the mighty scheme of the Canal was wrecked and the savings of the thrifty peasant were squandered will always excite interest and sympathy. But M. Lucas has drawn especial attention to the part played by the French Government, first in sharing the spoils, and afterwards in endeavouring to prevent any inquiry. Nothing but the extraordinary ability and persistence of M. Delahaye and the dauntless courage of M. Déroulède could have succeeded in dragging the culprits from their hiding-places and holding them up to the reprobation of the world. Up to the time when M. Lucas published his book six Ministers had already fallen, five others were under a cloud, and the President of the Chamber had been dismissed. The dastardly attempt of the Ministry to implicate the members of the Right had no other result than to bring further discredit upon themselves. Nevertheless, the mass of the French electors have lately shown that they are satisfied with the existing form of government. Is it not time for the Right to recognise this fact and to do their best to secure the presence of capable and honourable men among the Ministry? Hitherto they have acted upon the principle: *pour aller au mieux il*

faut passer par le pire. Has not "the worst" been reached already? They had better make the best of the Republic, at least until such time as some Royalist or Bonapartist hero shall arise.

T. B. S.

Histoire du R. P. de Clorivière de la Compagnie de Jésus.

Par le P. JACQUES TERRIEN, de la même Compagnie. 8vo, pp. 614. Paris: Ch. Poussielgue. 1892.

P. DE CLORIVIÈRE made his final vows as a Jesuit on the Feast of the Assumption 1773, the day before the suppression of the Society by Pope Clement XIV. He lived to see its revival by Pius VII., and had the happiness of spending his last years as a member of the order. As one of the links between the old Society and the new his life is of much interest. The English reader will note that Clorivière was educated by the English Benedictines at Douai. His knowledge of our language was of great use to him in after-life. When his religious brethren were expelled from France, he was transferred to the English province, and served in the English colleges abroad and also in England. This portion of his career is a valuable contribution to the history of the English Church during the early years of toleration.

T. B. S.

L'Adjudant-Général Jean Landrieux: Introduction à ses Mémoires. Par LÉONCE GRASILIER. 8vo, pp. 360. Paris: Albert Savine. 1893.

LANDRIEUX played an important part in the secret history of Napoleon's early campaigns in Italy. His conduct, however, proved so displeasing to the young conqueror, that he was never again employed in the army. His memoirs, written to justify himself, are now in course of publication. M. Léonce Grasilier, who has undertaken the work of editing them, has written an introductory volume giving an account of Landrieux's life before the Italian campaign, and also dealing with his relations with the Irish general, Kilmaine. This Introduction is the result of wide reading, and affords the editor the opportunity of correcting many misstatements of writers on the same period. His "Life of General Kilmaine," which is already in hand, will be awaited with interest.

T. B. S.

Honnête avant Tout. Par M. J. RIBET. 8vo, pp. 324. Paris : Delhomme et Briguet.

MEN often make no secret of their infidelity or failings against the moral law, but they never boast of being dishonest. Here then the Abbé Ribet finds ground common to the believer and unbeliever, and calls on both alike to be honest above all things. By honesty he means the observance of the second table of the Law—that is, respect for our neighbour's rights to his life, his wife, his goods, and his good name. After defining and dividing his subject, he devotes a long chapter to a scathing attack on the different classes of offenders against honesty. The priest is the first on his list, and certainly is not spared ; and “priest” is here meant to include “bishop,” as the good Abbé plainly indicates. Some fierce denunciations are levelled at the ecclesiastic who seeks to obtain a mitre as a reward for connivance with the misdeeds of the government. Then the judge, the lawyer, the doctor, the schoolmaster, the trader, the workman, the peasant, and many others come in for their share of castigation. The Jew and the Freemason, of course, receive the hardest knocks. Even M. Drumont might take lessons from the author of “Honnête avant Tout.” Finally, the various causes of dishonesty are pointed out and discussed with much shrewd knowledge of human nature. On the whole, this little book will be of great service to priests when preaching on the Commandments. They will find in it plenty of “up-to-date” matter set forth in that smart epigrammatic style for which Frenchmen are famous.

T. B. S.

1. **The Pentamerone.** By GIAMBATTISTA BASILE. Translated from the Neapolitan by JOHN EDWARD TAYLOR. New edition, revised and edited by HELEN ZIMMERN. 8vo, xii-218. London : Fisher Unwin. 1893.
2. **Finnish Legends for English Children.** By R. RIVIND. 8vo, pp. 214. London : Fisher Unwin. 1893.

THESE two volumes of the “Children's Library” have an interest and value for older students of folk-lore as well. They may be taken as representative of the two main branches into which the popular epos divides itself, roughly distinguishable as the Asiatic, and the Scandinavian or Teutonic. In the former, the main interest centres in the human element with demoniac agencies, adverse and favourable, intervening in the fortunes of the mortals concerned. The second bear the character rather of nature or elemental myths,

more or less disguised, the foundation of the drama being allegorical, and the human actors either subsidiary or symbolical. Thus in the flight of Aino from her aged spouse in the Finnish tale, we have a variant of the fable of Aurora and Tithonus, or the wooing of the radiant dawn by the decrepit dusk of the fading night. The Rainbow-maiden, who sits weaving her gold and silver tissues throned upon the bow of heaven, is one of the obvious embodiments of elemental phenomena, as are Ilmater, the daughter of the ether and Ilmarinen, the wondrous smith who forged the heavens all of one piece. The "Pentamerone," on the other hand, composed or compiled in the seventeenth century, is a storehouse of the more vulgar fable of human adventure modified by wizardry, and has required a large amount of expurgation to fit it either for children or any class of English readers. But as the vivacity of the Neapolitan imagination has here vivified the old subjects with its own peculiar humour, they form a very amusing collection of tales.

Les Tonga et le R. P. Joseph Chevron de la Société de Marie.

Par le P. A. MONFAT de la même Société. 8vo, pp. 473. Lyon : Emanuel Vitte.

THIS record of a heroic life is as full of the romance of adventure as it is of lessons of spiritual abnegation. Nowhere are the sacrifices required of the missionary more vividly brought home to the mind than in its simple narrative of suffering and submission. Père Chevron's life was one of perpetual self-immolation, from the moment when his call to the apostolate was first realised by him with its inexorable sentence of exile from home and all its cherished affections.

A loved and loving member of a united family, brought up amid all the elegancies and refinements of life, the recognition of his vocation was an agony to him from the first. Yet he never faltered in his obedience, and the ten years of probation imposed on him by his superior left him unshaken in his determination to follow it. This supreme sacrifice was a fitting preparation for the sufferings that ensued, when the commonest necessities of life were wanting to him, and the pangs of hunger were added to the other moral and material privations entailed on a man of fastidious nicety by his enforced association with people in the lowest stage of barbarism and degradation.

The Tonga, or Friendly Islands, of which he became the apostle and patriarch, are believed to have been colonised by a wave of Mongol migration, there parted into two streams, of which one

reached Samoa, and the other Fiji. Cannibalism, so prevalent that chiefs of the same party lay in wait to slaughter each other, was only abolished in 1809, by the decree of a sagacious ruler who, seeing the extermination of the population imminent, declared human flesh to be tabu. So apathetic were the natives that, despite the fertility of the soil, which renders one day's work in the week sufficient to provide amply for the wants of a family, they would endure the extremity of hunger rather than work, cheating its pangs by spending their time in sleep. This tendency was encouraged by the prevalence of communism, entitling all to share in the food prepared, or the harvest reaped, and thus enabling the idle to live on the labour of the industrious, if any such there had been. It was to these habits that the early sufferings of the missionaries were due, for food was scarcely to be had in the huts of the natives, while the system of pillage in vogue rendered it useless to attempt to raise it for themselves. Père Chevron at first shared the labours of Père Chanel, the proto-martyr of Oceania, since beatified, in the island of Futuna, but was early transferred to that of Tonga-Tapu, where nearly the whole of his missionary life of forty years was passed. Among his many trials was the persecution of his flock by King George, the convert of the Wesleyans, who laid siege to Pea, the Catholic stronghold, and reduced it after several months' investment. The fruit of years of labour seemed destroyed by the flight of some of the neophytes and the abjuration of others, but this disaster was followed by a great recovery, and even the dispersal of the Catholics tended to the diffusion of their faith, as they carried its seeds to other islands of the archipelago. The visible teaching conveyed in the life of Père Chevron was the means of working a miraculous change in the manners of these ferocious savages, who formed, before his death, model Christian communities. Though of frail constitution, and slowly failing in health for many years, he lived to celebrate his sacerdotal jubilee, and the rejoicing in which all the islanders, even the Wesleyan converts, took part, was a wonderful testimonial to the affection he had at last won from hearts hardened by the inherited vices of paganism. This touching record of a life of such self-devotion gains an added charm from the simple grace with which it is narrated, and would well repay translation into English.

La Route du Tchad, du Loango au Chari. Par JEAN DYBOWSKI.

Large 8vo, pp. 381. Paris: Firmin Didot & Cie. 1893.

THE exploratory mission of which M. Dybowski tells the story in an ample volume, enriched with 136 original drawings, was intended to be auxiliary to that of M. Crampel, and started in 1891,

a year later than he did, in order to follow on his track, and combine with him in the interior of Africa. The design of the first explorer, of penetrating through the unknown regions about Lake Tchad to Algeria, was, as we know, frustrated by his death at the hands of the savage tribes in the basin of the Chari, and M. Dybowski felt it incumbent on him to avenge him by a night attack on the camp of his supposed murderers, in which many were killed and wounded. Returning after this exploit by the route along which he had advanced, he descended the Oubangi, the great northern affluent of the Congo. This river was traversed in steamer and canoes as far as Bembe, five degrees from the equator, and as it is destined to play a large part in the future development of Africa, all his details of its scenery and inhabitants are full of interest. Among the Afourus, who occupy the country near its junction with the Congo, he found human sacrifices practised by the chiefs, either to propitiate the divinities, or merely as a form of ostentation. The men, captured for the purpose from neighbouring villages, are slaughtered wholesale, their heads being preserved as trophies. Yet in this district, at Lyrango, the Catholic mission, consisting of three Fathers, the most advanced towards the interior on this side, remains unmolested, and on friendly terms with the natives.

Die Willensfreiheit und ihre Gegner. Von Dr. C. GUTBERLET.
8vo, pp. 270. Fulda. 1893.

DR. GUTBERLET is well known in Germany as one of the ablest Catholic defenders of the truths of natural religion; and the small volume before us will certainly add to his deserved reputation. A very brief account of its contents will show its practical importance at the present day, when the freedom of the will is so persistently attacked on all sides. The author begins with a definition of free-will, which he shows is a choice of means to an end. To establish that such a freedom of choice exists, he appeals to the testimony of consciousness in all men not "debauched by philosophy," of which the clearest proof is the universal belief in responsibility, and the consequent apportionment of praise and reward, or blame and punishment. In all this part of the book there is little or nothing new, the ordinary arguments being stated clearly and with sobriety. There is more scope for originality in dealing with the objections that have been raised of late years. Perhaps the most plausible of these is based upon the statistics of all kinds of voluntary acts, especially of crimes and offences against the law, which demonstrate that these are subject to uniformities as

distinct as any that prevailed in natural phenomena. Dr. Gutberlet analyses very carefully the figures that have been worked out, and shows conclusively that the figures do not prove that the will is not free in its choice, but that it acts according to rules and motives, and therefore with uniform results when large groups of men are dealt with instead of individuals. The results of the statistical method have their value in showing us how an all-wise Governor of the universe can so order the environment and relations of rational beings as to make them in the mass carry out any end He may design, although each individual is free.

Another recent objection to the freedom of the will is grounded on the observations of the so-called anthropological school, of which Professor Lombroso is the chief and best known representative. He has shown that the anatomical peculiarities of habitual criminals are as definite and uniform as the kindred characteristics of idiocy and epilepsy ; and he argues that they are evidences of reversion to an atavistic type when human beings were not free. Our author appears hardly to realise the force which the results of the anthropological school have for biologists and physicians—in short, for all who are in the habit of weighing similar evidence. Whatever their value and interest, they deal only with abnormal states, and the most they prove is that there are more such human beings in the world than we knew before. Nor can it be urged that the characteristics of habitual criminals give us any reliable information as to the condition of primitive man, for they are at least as likely to be due to a process of degeneration as to reversion to ancestral characters.

The most determined of recent opponents of free-will have been the physiological psychologists of Germany, headed by Wundt. He protests on the metaphysical ground that a free act is necessarily an uncaused one, and is therefore inconceivable as being a contradiction in terms, a confusion which Dr. Gutberlet has no difficulty in exposing. Nor is the suggestion more formidable, that all our actions, including voluntary ones, are merely varieties of the reflex activity of the nervous system in response to a stimulus : for the facts of life unmistakably testify that those very acts which we recognise as voluntary are often performed in opposition to external impressions.

The arguments against free-will raised by purely speculative philosophy will be less attractive to the general reader. But the account given of the controversy as carried on by disciples of Schopenhauer and Lotze will be of great interest to the student of philosophy, and is full of that lucidity which is the most valuable

quality in philosophical criticism. Hartmann is only incidentally mentioned, his system having been dealt with in another volume but there is a full account of the objections to free-will made by a modern Danish philosopher, Harald Höffding, many of which are new in form if not in substance. This very meagre account of Dr. Gutberlet's volume will at any rate serve to welcome gladly an addition of value to Catholic philosophy, and will show that it is indispensable to all students of the very important subject it treats so well.

Marie Bonneau de Miramion. By CECILIA MARY CADDELL. 8vo, pp. 188. London and Leamington: The Art and Book Company.

WE welcome a new edition of this interesting little "Life," by the gifted author of "Wild Times." The heroic acts of Marie de Rubelle—afterwards Marie Bonneau de Miramion—as maiden, wife, widow, and mother (for her widowhood dawned before her early motherhood), are well worthy of being told and re-told. The story of her abduction while reading like a chapter of a romance of the reign of "the Merry Monarch," proves the truth of the old adage, "truth is stranger than fiction." Her trust in God under the most hopeless circumstances, humanly speaking, was of the most perfect order. A widow and a mother at the age of seventeen, she resists all negotiations for a second marriage, and lives "in the world but not of it," until it pleased the Divine Spouse to ask her for her heart. The friend of St. Vincent de Paul, and the almoner of the fourteenth Louis, she was as humble as if she were of low degree instead of being the daughter of one of the noblest of the French nobility and the widow of another of the same class. Her labours in the Hôtel Dieu, her connection with the Daughters of St. Geneviève, her foundation of the "Sainte Famille," and of "La chambre de travail de la Paroisse," are all worthy of admiration, if not of imitation.

The care of her own daughter and of her spiritual daughters, as well as of poor sinful girls whom she rescued from a life worse than death, was heaven-inspired, and she never wavered in spending her fortune and her life in their service. A peaceful death closed a saintly and an arduous life. Those of our readers who have not read "Marie Bonneau de Miramion" should procure a copy of this new edition.

Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis. Seine Geschichte und sein Inhalt. Von P. GUITBERT BAEUMER, Benediktiner der Beuroner Congregation. 8vo, pp. 236. Mainz : Verlag von Franz Kirchheim. 1893.

THIS small volume of 236 pages, giving a history and explanation of the Apostles' Creed, is scholarly written. It is highly interesting and merits all our praise, for who does not like to be acquainted with the history of a prayer which we daily recite ? and Father Guitbert Baeumer gives us its history in a manner both pleasing and instructive. The author is thoroughly conversant with his subject, for in a masterly way he describes all the various phases through which the Apostles' Creed passed till it received, in the beginning of the sixth century, its present form.

If we were asked to give in few words the conclusion of Father Baeumer's historical investigation, we should answer : "our Creed is called the Apostles' Creed because it contains those chief truths of Christian doctrine which formed the principal contents of the Apostolic preaching." When the *Catechismus Romanus* says : "Sancti Apostoli, Divino Spiritu afflati, Christianae fidei formulam componendam censuerunt," and "hanc Christianae fidei et spei professionem a se compositam Symbolum appellarunt," and "duodecim Symboli articulis distinxerunt," it merely adopts the tradition common in the Middle Ages and held by some of the Fathers, that the Apostles, before separating, in council and under Divine Inspiration, composed our present Symbolum. In a sermon formerly ascribed to St. Augustine, but really from the sixth century, we find this opinion expressed in the following manner : "Petrus dixit, Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, Creatorem coeli et terrae ; Andreas dixit, Et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unicum Dominum nostrum ; Jacobus dixit, Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine, etc."

The first traces of the Apostles' Creed we meet in the southern part of France towards the close of the fifth century. A certain Faustus, Bishop of Reji or Reiz, 460-490, says, in his work, "De Spiritu Sancto," that the Symbolum contains a summary of the doctrine of the Catholic Church. From different works of Faustus, in which the articles of the Symbolum are quoted, Fr. Baeumer obtains the following version :

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem (Creatorem coeli et terrae). Credo et in Filium ejus (unicum) Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine (passus sub Pontio Pilato), crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus : (descendit ad inferos) : tertia die resurrexit (a mortuis) : ascendit ad coelos, sedet ad dextram Dei Patris

omnipotentis ; inde venturus (est) judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, Sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem, vitam aeternam.

The words between parentheses are wanting, but may be supplied from a Homily (Sermo 242 de Symbolo vi., ad Competentes), which, though published amongst the works of St. Augustine, is not of this father, but may, with a considerable amount of probability, be ascribed to Faustus.

In the fourth and fifth centuries *Symbola Fidei* were frequently used in the Church. The fathers often make mention of them. But although their contents may be said to be substantially the same, they differ greatly as to their wording both from each other and from our present version. As an example we will give the *Symbolum* used in the Church of Antioch, as we have it from John Cassian, a Gallican priest, in his work against Nestorius :

Nunc ad fidem Antiocheni Symboli virtutemque veniamus. In quam ipse (Nestorius) baptizatus sit ac renatus suis etiam professionibus argui, suis ut ita dicam armis conteri potest. Textus ergo ac fides Antiocheni Symboli haec est. Credo in unum et solum verum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, Creatorem omnium visibilium et invisibilium creaturarum, et in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unigenitum, et primogenitum totius creaturae, ex eo natum ante omnia saecula et non factum, Deum verum ex Deo vero, homoousion Patri, per quem et saecula compaginata sunt et omnia facta. Qui propter nos venit; et natus est ex Maria Virgine. Et crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus. Et tertia die resurrexit secundum scripturas. Et in coelos ascendit. Et iterum venit judicare vivos et mortuos. Et reliqua.

The third part of this creed, containing the doctrine on the Holy Ghost and the Church, Cassian has omitted, perhaps as not necessary for his purpose. As to the three first centuries, the fathers, it is true, contain many allusions and extracts from the *Symbolum* of their days ; they even have left behind certain *Regulae Fidei*, but we do not possess from them any complete explanation or scientific discussion on this subject.

It is clear from Fr. Baeumer's able investigation that an apostolic authorship in the ordinary sense can no longer be claimed for our creed. Yet Fr. Baeumer admits the possibility that the Apostles composed a *Symbolum* which might well have been the basis of our present creed. He recommends this possibility for various reasons. He finds, for instance, allusions to a *symbolum* in the epistles of St. Paul. In 1 Timothy vi. 11, St. Paul exhorts his disciple, " Lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art called, and hast confessed a confession before many witnesses." The confession of which St. Paul speaks, Fr. Baeumer argues, presupposes a sort of *symbolum fidei*. He

next compares our creed with the sermons of St. Peter, Acts ii. 3 ; iii. 26, and concludes that the contents and order of ideas are the same as in our creed. He considers it, moreover, necessary that the Apostles or their disciples should have composed a symbolum. The spreading of the faith amongst the heathen, with their philosophical systems, the persecutions, the rising of heresies, required that the newly converted Pagan or Jew should give a guarantee of the sincerity of his faith before receiving baptism. Hence the widely spread custom during the first centuries of the Church of requiring from the catechumen an explicit confession of faith in the main articles of the Christian doctrine.

Geschichte des Alten Testaments mit besondere Rücksicht auf das Verhältnis von Bibel und Wissenschaft.—Von Dr. EMILIAN SCHÖPFER. Erster Hallband. Brixen, Verlag der Buchhandlung des Katholisch-politischen Pressvereins.

DR. SCHÖPFER gives us in this work a history of the people of Israel. The work, however, is, as the title indicates, not merely a narrative of the wonderful events through which the nation of Israel has passed, but it discusses also those scientific, critical, and historical questions which are so closely connected with it. Of the two volumes, in which the work will be completed, the present volume, containing 240 pages, traces the history of Israel from the creation of the world till the death of Josue. The book is neatly printed, the paper is good, and the type large and distinct. It is, moreover, well written ; the style being such as the subject requires, grave, simple, and clear. A proper and systematic order has been observed throughout the book, and on the whole the author has acquitted himself of his task with great success.

Although the work seems to be more directly composed for the use of theological students, yet we do not hesitate to recommend it to a wider sphere of readers. The volume, though comparatively small, contains a wonderful amount of information, and the author has taken care that it should be up to date.

It is the result of extensive reading and of much serious study. The modern problems, such as the creation of the world, the authorship and composition of some of our sacred books, are not merely noticed, but are treated at a length and in a manner proportionate to their importance. No less, for instance, than thirty pages are devoted to the discussion of what Dr. Schöpfer calls “Wellhausen’s theory on the authorship of the Pentateuch.” The name, however, is not correct. The conclusion of the higher criticism concerning

the Pentateuch are no more the discovery of Wellhausen than that of any other critic, for they are the result of the combined labour of the most eminent scholars in Europe from the beginning of this century till the present day. With regard to the authorship of the Pentateuch, Dr. Schöpfer maintains a strongly conservative position.

Saturday Dedicated to Mary. From the Italian of Father Cabrini, S.J. With Preface and Introduction, by FATHER CLARKE, S.J. London : Burns & Oates. 1893. Quarterly Series.

THIS excellent and pious book contains fifty-two meditations, one for each Saturday in the year. The author has arranged his subject matter in chronological order. He follows the series of events of Mary's life, as they gradually show forth all her wonderful gifts, privileges, and virtues, beginning with her Immaculate Conception, or rather with God's eternal decrees concerning her, till her coronation in Heaven, including the protection she thence continues to exercise over her devoted children on earth. As for the meditations themselves, we cannot do better than by quoting a few words from Father Clarke's able preface :

They put forward the virtues, privileges, and prerogatives of the holy Mother of God with a fulness of detail, and with a picturesque simplicity that is admirably calculated to kindle devotion to Mary, and foster the love of her incomparable virtues, and desire to imitate them. They are the work of a good theologian, and the pious reflections they contain have invariably a sound theological basis. They are methodical, inspired by a devoted love of Mary, illustrated by constant quotations from the Saints and Doctors of the Church, and at the end of each some history is narrated which brings out the prerogative of Mary that is its special subject.

The Principles of Ethics, Vol. II. By HERBERT SPENCER. London : Williams & Norgate. 1893.

MR. SPENCER has so far recovered from his long illness as to be able now to put forth a continuation of the system of morals to which he has given himself. But the present volume will not be found to contain much that is new. Like those which have gone before it, while in diction copious, and in well-adapted illustrations fertile and full of interest, the book is little more than a commentary upon "The Data of Ethics," and must be submitted to the same kind of criticism. On the problems of conduct, public, private, and individual, which mostly occupy our thoughts to-day,

Mr. Spencer expresses himself with a mild, yet dogmatic, firmness, which is in striking contrast to the wise diffidence of men of the world like Aristotle, or of contemplative minds like St. Thomas. Steady, persevering, and surely rather dull, this insular treatment of all the great questions cannot but seem wanting in breadth and height to the student who knows more than one philosophy. It has no inspiration to bear it up, no ether in which to float; and the eternal balancing of my pleasure against yours, the book-keeping, as in some universal provider's, which sets remote against immediate consequences, and is nothing if not mercantile, leaves a sense of distaste and weariness—the sure result when morality is pulled down from its high estate, and becomes, as Plato would say, “the art of measurement,” not the pursuit of good and avoidance of evil without regard to “consequences.”

As in dealing with First Principles altogether, so in Ethics, Mr. Spencer has a false air of agreeing with the old school of intuition against the new, which, in Bentham, Mill, and Huxley, relies upon experience, and casts away the *a priori*. Bentham, for instance, would regulate conduct by calculating the happiness within reach; but Mr. Spencer will not hear of so short-sighted an expedient; no, he says, we must go by justice and the laws of nature dictated by justice. All which, however, turns out to be misleading. Justice never signifies, in this volume, giving every man his due because it is right—in the only distinct, aboriginal, and recognised meaning of “right,” as differing from the expedient or the agreeable—it does but amount to a law of the useful, which mankind, by long ages of trial, have found to work well. In principle, Bentham and Mr. Spencer agree utterly; they pursue varying methods, that is all. For the expediency of “the den”—to speak with Lord Bacon—which was Bentham’s rule, Mr. Spencer would substitute the expediency of “the tribe.” But his *bonum honestum* is nothing else than *bonum utile* or *bonum delectabile*; it never is the thing in itself which we know as the moral “Ought,” and which cannot be an accident or a mere result of any other kind of good. The sharpest and most searching judgment on this fundamental perversion of languages and ideas may be read in Dr. Ward’s masterly treatise “On Nature and Grace.” There, in remarkably plain language, the great truth on which ethical science depends, is brought to light, and we are made aware that “right” and “ought” are primitive, not derived from other conceptions, nor to be resolved into them, but self-evident intuitions, wholly of their own kind, like the idea of “the beautiful,” or of “cause,” or of “intellect” itself. With this clue we cannot go wrong, even in Mr. Spencer’s maze. But we should bear in mind

that the distinction between the ethical and the expedient, though always a part of Catholic teaching, has been in some measure obscured in our text-books by the practice of discussing, after Ciceron and Aristotle, the question of the *summum bonum* on stereotyped lines. The change introduced by Kant, not, indeed, as regards the notion, but in language and terminology, had, at least, one good effect. Not only did it wake philosophers from their "dogmatic dream" by asking them to examine the structure of their thoughts, it gave to moral science a character *sui generis* which set it free from even the slightest risk of being confounded with Hedonism, or the mere pursuit of happiness.

But Mr. Spencer, in the letters which he prints between himself and Mr. Llewellyn Davies, adds one more proof that he cannot so much as imagine a "categorical imperative" which we obey because we "ought," and not because of "consequences" to ourselves or others. He does actually believe that the difference between himself and men who repudiate the principles of the Utilitarian school, turns simply on the question whether we take into account the "ultimate consequences" of our acts, or only their more or less immediate effects in the way of "agreeable feeling." It seems hopeless to argue when the issues have been so completely misapprehended. To keep in view "consequences," whether likely to happen now or on the Day of Judgment, may be, or rather certainly is, the duty of rational creatures; but volitions which are determined simply by the agreeable feeling they will produce, are in no sense ethical, for they do not contain the element of doing right because it is right, which to ethical choice is essential and indispensable. And Dr. Martineau has made short work of the optimism which from self-interest would derive universal benevolence, or identify the progress of the species with the happiness of the individual.

Significantly enough, in this volume the author makes no pretence to found his conclusions on the results of "evolution," by which he means a blind law, issuing in the survival of those organisms which are fitted to survive. Evolution thus imagined has been commonly charged with a disregard which would be cruel, if it were conscious, of the finer qualities in our make. Of course Mr. Spencer understands by "Justice" letting evolution have its way, though countless individuals be trampled under its rolling wheels. Yet, when he comes to lay down rules for our conduct, he finds it needful to temper this ferocious code with mercy and benevolence. The "fittest" are actually to bear with the unfit, in some degree at least; and evolution is to be modified by a principle of very different scope. In the ethics of mercy we are to say, "Live and

let live," although evolution has never hesitated to employ all its power against the feeble, the ignorant, and the miscalculating. What, we may truly ask, has the struggle of "mights" to do with the establishment of "rights" as such? If there is justice in the course of things, it implies a quality in the unknowable which (as Mr. Spencer would find on giving it due consideration) brings back the old questions of theology, and with them the need of an answer of which in his pages there has never been a trace. Or, if the idea and the "sentiment" of justice be "a conscious response to certain necessary relations in the order of Nature," it is clear that evolution ought to mean Providence. And then the survival of the fittest—that is to say, of all who have a right to survive—will lead on to inquiries concerning judgment to come and eternal life, which, as we deem, are somewhat more momentous than the thousand and one details of temporal progress, with which these so-called ethics are concerned.

Experience occasionally shows [says Mr. Spencer, in a concluding section, which is not without pathos] that there may arise extreme interest in pursuing entirely unselfish ends, and as time goes on there will be more and more of those whose unselfish end will be the further evolution of humanity. While contemplating from the heights of thought that far-off life of the race never to be enjoyed by them, but only by a remote posterity, they will feel a calm pleasure in the consciousness of having aided the advance towards it.

This may remind us of Dorothea Brooke's creed expressed in "Middlemarch," of "widening the skirts of light." It imagines the heaven of the human race to be on this planet, and the life of the individual to be a means, not an end in itself. Does it answer to man's deepest thought? Is it enough to satisfy his reason or his nature? And is it so much as consistent, or not self-contradictory, even in these few lines? The "extreme interest" and the "calm pleasure," have they no tincture of selfishness in them? Are they not forms of "agreeable feeling"? And from this point of view shall we term them ethical, when they are, in truth, the extreme of refined self-indulgence? But if the "further evolution of humanity" be ever so desirable an aim, what obligation have I, the creature of a day, to trouble myself about it? Shall I be told by Mr. Spencer that it is my "right," if not my "duty," to take up this benevolent task? What, on his line of argument, are rights or duties but "moments" of feeling? Evidently, whether I help to advance humanity, or whether I let it alone, the obligation or the inducement is mere pleasure; the act has no ethical motive, the end is my own satisfaction, and the good I aim at is exactly the same in essence as that which any creature, endowed with sensation, might enjoy.

The whole range of ethics, another world indeed, which unfolds itself from the idea of duty, lies beyond this epicurean realm, with its pains and pleasures, its feelings and appetites, its desire of delight which at length is its only law. Neither egoism nor altruism can furnish aught but the matter of moral good; spirit and inward make are not utilitarian. Mr. Spencer combines the selfishness of the individual with the selfishness of the race, and argues that their union is morality. Both the race and the individual, we reply with St. Thomas, are under an eternal law, which is the Divine essence, or the "nature of things" itself; and according to that law "right" is antecedent to all experience of the tribe and the man; it regulates selfishness and is not regulated by it, and to deduce it from the agreeable or the advantageous will be just the same as putting effects for causes and inverting the order of the world. When duty has become self-indulgence it will have passed into its contrary, and so perished.

WILLIAM BARRY.

La Vierge Marie: *Histoire de la Mère de Dieu d'après la Révélation et les révélations.* Par Mgr. RICARD, prélat de la maison de Sa Sainteté. 8vo, pp. 300. (Illus.) Paris : Librairie de Firmin-Didot et Cie., 56 Rue Jacob.

IN this work Mgr. Ricard gives us a devout and ably written history of the life of our Blessed Lady. Although we are in possession of many beautiful histories of God's holy Mother, composed by the most excellent Catholic writers, yet the pious reader will find in the present volume many fresh and pious reflections. The actual history of the Blessed Virgin is preceded by a few highly interesting and instructive chapters. They contain a learned interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies announcing the coming Redeemer and His mother, a short and pleasing narrative of the holy women who have always been considered as types of the Blessed Virgin, and a most useful explanation of those emblematic names by which Catholics are wont to call her. The volume, therefore, recommends itself not only for pious reading but also for instruction and meditation. The work of the publisher is quite in keeping with that of the writer, for the volume is beautifully printed, its paper is excellent, and it is illustrated with thirty-seven very fine engravings.

The Ceremonies of Ordination with the Ceremonies of the Masses, Private and Solemn, in which Orders are Conferred. By Rev. PATRICK O'LEARY, Dean, Maynooth College. 8vo, pp. 236. Dublin : Browne and Nolan.

THIS little volume is the most comprehensive handbook of the Rite of Ordination and its attendant ceremonies which has been published in these countries. It has been compiled by the Dean of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, mainly for the use of the ordinands, the assistants, and the choir of that college, but it will be found useful in all ecclesiastical colleges. The subject is treated most fully and in a most satisfactory manner, Martinucci, the latest and perhaps the best Roman ceremonialist, being copied most accurately. However, the author, considering Martinucci defective on some points, has supplied the defects from De Herdt, Vavasseur, and other authorities. The book has been revised by the Right Rev. Monsignor Browne, President of St. Patrick's College, and bears the imprimatur of his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin.

The Catholic Doctrine of Faith and Morals, gathered from Sacred Scripture, Decrees of Councils, and approved Catechisms. 8vo, pp. 429. By Very Rev. WILLIAM BYRNE, D.D., Vicar-General of the Archdiocese of Boston. Boston : Cashman, Keating & Co.

THIS is a valuable sequel to, or substitute for, Bossuet's "L'Exposition de la Doctrine Catholique," Cardinal Gibbons's "Faith of Our Fathers," or Father Faa Di Bruno's "Catholic Belief." The author covers ground already traversed by his illustrious predecessors in a manner entirely different and yet very effectively. His book will serve priests as a ready manual for short catechetical instructions, and is most suitable to place in the hands of sincere Protestants who are seeking to know what Catholics really believe. The author has received commendatory letters from several of the hierarchy of the United States, including his Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, who writes :

Your book on "Catholic Doctrine," though unpretentious in size, is comprehensive in scope, embracing as it does the creeds and sacraments of the Church, and the moral law. Besides the valuable information it gives to the general reader, it will serve as a commentary on the Catechism, and will prove a useful *vade mecum* to Sunday-school and other teachers who are engaged in instructing our Catholic youth.

Instructions et Conseils aux Filles domestiques, et à tous les domestiques en général. Par l'Abbé C. J. BUSSON. 3^{me} Édition. 8vo, pp. 496. Paris : Gaume et Cie. 1893.

THIS is a very useful treatise for any one who has the spiritual care of servants, or for communities such as sisters of mercy or of charity, who have to give instructions to girls about to enter service.

The order of the book is good, but the different points are in some cases too long drawn out for our English notions; however, with culling this could easily be rectified. If we say that the author had probably taken Lewis of Granada's "Memorial," and arranged it to suit his purpose, perhaps no greater praise could be given. The book is replete with examples of those who have attained high perfection in the position of domestic service, the author well says there is no better way of instructing than by a trite example. I fear, however, the example he has set would be too high, spiritually, for many of our domestics.

The book is the outcome of the directorship of a confraternity especially for servants. Have we this confraternity in England? The Sisters of Mercy and of Charity, those of the most Holy Cross and Passion, and many other religious bodies take great interest in servants. The spirit of the arch-confraternity called des Filles de l'accomptoir is contained in this book; it might with advantage be studied, and if possible the confraternity adopted in some of our larger centres where Catholic servants are numerous.

The Abbé Busson has an ideal of the value of service as a means of sanctification, he has also an ideal of the position of master and mistress. I wonder how often the following is realised even in Catholic homes. Speaking about young people going to service, he says : "Vous trouvez chez des maîtres honnêtes gens et Chrétiens des conseillers, des guides, des surveillants, and des pères. Leur devoir est de veiller sur votre conduite, de s'enquérir de vos démarches, de connaître quelles sont vos liaisons, vos amies, vos connaissances, de vous détourner du mal par la voie de la persuasion et par celle de l'autorité quand il le faut," &c., &c.

Is this the idea of the register offices? Might we not in some things that have reference to soul-saving sigh for the feudal times?

G. R.

The Book of Enoch. Translated from Dillmann's Ethiopic Text. Emended and revised in accordance with hitherto uncollected Ethiopic MSS., &c., and edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by R. H. Charles, M.A. 8vo, pp. 275. Oxford : Clarendon Press. 1893.

FOREMOST in interest and importance among pre-Christian apocryphal writings is the somewhat miscellaneous collection of apocalyptic pieces, of diverse authorship, which in the second and first centuries B.C. gathered itself about the name of Enoch, and which, besides being once quoted by St. Jude, received some measure of recognition by the earlier fathers of the Church, until in the fourth and fifth centuries it was finally proscribed as spurious.

Until the later years of the eighteenth century, "Enoch" was known only through certain fragments, extending from ch. vi. to ch. xvi., which had been preserved in the *Chronographia* of George Syncellus (*circ. A.D. 800*), and through a few meagre quotations and allusions in earlier writers ; and to this day no complete MS. of the Greek text of "Enoch" (itself a translation from the Hebrew) is known to exist. But in the Ethiopic Church it would seem that "Enoch" has from early times been regarded as canonical, or at any rate has always been held in high esteem ; thence it has come about that the book has been preserved entire in many Ethiopic MSS. The Ethiopic version was first brought to light by the traveller Bruce, who in 1773 brought three MSS. of it to England. From one of these Lawrence made his translation in 1821. Lawrence's version, however, and a German translation by Hoffmann (1838), were superseded by that of Dillmann, which appeared in 1851, and which is described by Mr. Charles as "an almost perfect translation" of the text which the great Ethiopic scholar had at his disposal. Unfortunately, this text, which was based on a collection of five MSS., was in very many places extremely corrupt, and the best thanks of Biblical students are due to Mr. Charles for his laborious and successful efforts to turn to good account the documentary materials which have been made accessible since the appearance of Dillmann's translation. These fresh materials consist chiefly of eleven Ethiopic MSS., of which ten are in the British Museum, the greater number of them having formed part of the spoils brought to this country by the Magdala Expedition of 1867-8. Of all these British Museum MSS. Mr. Charles has made use, and of the two most important of them he has made a full collection. The result of his labours is shown in his critical notes, which embody more than 600 corrections of Dillmann's text and translation ; and it is a satisfaction to be able to record that with many of these corrections, put forward by way of speci-

men in a preliminary paper (*Academy*, November 26, 1892), Dillmann has expressed his full concurrence. Moreover, a considerable number of Mr. Charles's emendations of Dillmann's text has received confirmation from a quite different quarter. While his book was passing through the press, and, indeed, after the greater part of it was already in type, M. Bouriant published a complete Greek text of ch. i.-xxxii., which had been discovered at Akhmim, together with the now famous fragment of the Gospel of Peter, in 1886. The text Mr. Charles has fortunately been able to reproduce in an appendix, and it has not only confirmed, as has been said, many of his previous emendations, but it has suggested a large number of additional changes, which, in a second edition, will be promoted from their present obscure position in the notes on an appendix to their proper place in the body of the work.

We will not weary the reader with an analysis of the contents of "Enoch," or with a discussion of the probable dates of its several parts. It may be enough to mention that the book consists of a series of revelations and visions supposed to have been granted to the personage whose name it bears, and professing to relate, *inter alia*, the history of the fall of the angels, and to convey a good deal of instruction, ethical and physical, and a large measure of prophecy, chiefly Messianic and eschatological. To the ordinary student the chief interest of "Enoch" will probably be in its very numerous anticipations of New Testament phraseology. To specify only a few of the more striking instances of parallels with the language of the Gospels (Charles, pp. 48-49), we find "the generation of light" (En. cviii. 11, cf. Lu. xvi. 8, "Sons of Light"); "mansions of the righteous" (En. xxxix. 4, cf. Jo. xiv. 2, "many mansions"); "He will put down the kings from their thrones" (En. xlvi. 5, cf. Lu. i. 52); "Mammon of unrighteousness" (En. lxiii. 10, cf. Lu. xvi. 9); "When they see the Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory" (En. lxii. 5, cf. Matt. xix. 28); "It had been good for them if they had not been born" (En. xxxviii. 2, cf. Matt. xxvi. 25).

Very interesting is Mr. Charles's discussion of the origin and meaning of the phrase, "the Son of Man," of the use of which "Enoch" (*passim*) supplies an example intermediate between Dan. vii. and the Gospels, and shows that the expression already formed a part of the accepted Christology when our Lord took it up and adopted it. Mr. Charles fully recognises that "the title, 'the Son of Man,' in 'Enoch' was undoubtedly derived from Dan. vii.;" but we think that he exaggerates somewhat when he says that "a whole world of thought lies between the suggestive words in Daniel and the definite rounded conception as it appears in 'Enoch'" (pp. 314, 315). Instead

of laying stress on the contrast between the indefinite form in Daniel ("a Son of Man") and the "perfectly definite and distinctive title" in "Enoch," it would, we think, have been wiser to recognise the fact (as we believe it to be) that the definite title in Enoch bears witness to the current and correct interpretation of the Danielic prophecy. With what follows, however, we entirely agree, and with this quotation we may fitly close our very imperfect notice of this noble monument of English scholarship :

This title, with its supernatural (?) divine attributes of superhuman glory, of universal dominion and supreme judicial powers [as described in "Enoch"] was adopted by our Lord. The Son of Man has come down from heaven, S. John iii. 13 (cf. En. xlvi. 2); He is Lord of the Sabbath, S. Matt. xii. 8; can forgive sins, S. Matt. ix. 6; and all judgment is committed unto Him, S. John v. 22, 27 (cf. En. lxix. 27). But while retaining its supernatural associations, this title underwent transformation in our Lord's use of it—a transformation that all Pharisaic ideas, so far as He adopted them, likewise underwent. And just as His kingdom in general formed a standing protest against the prevailing Messianic ideas of temporal glory and dominion, so the title "the Son of Man" assumed a deeper spiritual significance; and this change we shall best apprehend if we introduce into the Enoch conception of the Son of Man the Isaiah conception of the Servant of Jehovah. *These two conceptions, though outwardly antithetic, are through the transformation of the former reconciled and fulfilled in a deeper unity—in the New Testament Son of Man.* He that was greatest was likewise servant of all. This transformed conception of the Son of Man is thus permeated throughout by the Isaiah conception of the Servant of Jehovah; but though the Enochic conception is fundamentally transformed, the transcendent claims underlying it are not for a moment foregone. We can [thus] understand how on the one hand the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head (S. Matt. viii. 20); and yet be Lord of the Sabbath (S. Matt. xiii. 8); how He is to be despised and rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be put to death (S. Luke ix. 22), and yet be the Judge of all mankind (S. John v. 27). In S. John xii. 34 it is just the strangeness of this *new* conception of this current phrase of a Messiah who was to suffer death that makes the people ask, "Who is this Son of Man? We have heard of the law that the Christ abideth for ever" (pp. 315–317).

L'Argument de Saint Anselme ; Étude philosophique par le

Père Ragey, Mariste. 8vo, pp. 201. Delhomme et Briguet, Editeurs. Paris: 13 Rue de l'Abbaye. Lyon : 3 Avenue de l'Archevêché.

FAATHER RAGEY, who has already written much on St. Anselm, undertakes now to explain in its true light the famous argument for the existence of God which was invented by the saint, and bears his name. Our author is of opinion that it is high time that the argument should be explained, inasmuch as it has been misinterpreted from St. Anselm's day down to our own times. The one to whom the

misinterpretation is chiefly to be charged is, it appears, St. Thomas Aquinas :

Many think [says Father Ragey] that this question has been settled long ago, and that to understand the argument of St. Anselm, there is no need to study the Proslogion, and the subtle objections of Gaunilo, and the answer of St. Anselm, but that all that is required is to read three lines of the "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas. St. Thomas has formulated in these three lines an objection, which is the very argument of St. Anselm reduced to its simplest expression. In three other lines he refuted this objection. And thus, by reading six very clear lines of St. Thomas, we learn what St. Anselm's argument is and what it is worth."

So think the many, but Father Ragey thinks otherwise. And while standing aloof from the crowd, he does not stand entirely alone. He is able to quote in support of his contention a certain M. Bouchitté, who does not hesitate to say, "Thomas, Duns Scotus, Gerson, and the majority of the scholastics proved that they did not understand the argument of St. Anselm," and also the authority of Leibnitz, who, however, whether through lack of knowledge or through lack of courage, speaks somewhat less resolutely than M. Bouchitté. After assigning the *a priori* argument to St. Anselm, and stating that it had received the attention of the scholastic writers, Leibnitz goes on to say, "Quamquam mihi Thomas de eo non satis accurate judicare videatur." St. Thomas has thus been the chief offender, but St. Anselm's argument has also had to suffer, according to our author, from its injudicious advocates of modern times. Father Ragey plays hare and hounds with these injudicious advocates. In his preface he states that St. Anselm's argument is "un argument que Descartes, Leibnitz, Fénélon, et Malebranche ont adopté, remanié et défendu avec passion." On page 133 of his book he writes, "Quand on étudie la marche suivie par le Père Kleutgen dans la réfutation de cet argument on s'aperçoit, à ne pouvoir en douter, qu'il ne l'a étudié que dans ses partisans modernes, Descartes, Leibnitz, Fénélon, Malebranche, sans s'être reporté aux vraies sources." Now, either Descartes, Leibnitz, Fénélon, and Malebranche adopted and defended St. Anselm's argument, as the author states in his preface, or they did not. If they did, then Kleutgen, in refuting the argument of Descartes, &c., was refuting the argument of St. Anselm. If they did not, then Father Ragey is not entitled to appeal, as he does, to the reputation of these philosophers in support of the argument.

However, Father Ragey is of opinion that St. Anselm's reasoning has been universally and persistently misrepresented, and that justice will not be done to it until it is studied in the very words of St.

Anselm. It is to enable us so to study it that Father Ragey has written this little work.

Le Problème Spiritualiste, l'Existence de l'Âme, Conférences adressées aux étudiants de Rennes. Par L'ABBÉ H. CEILLIER, chanoine honoraire, professeur de Philosophie au Grand Séminaire. Delhomme et Briguet, 13 Rue de l'Abbaye, Paris. 8vo, p. 286.

IN eight conferences addressed to the students who were fortunate enough to possess so eloquent and able a professor, M. Ceillier discusses the existence of the soul. The first conference is introductory. The question under discussion is stated. "Is there in man a spiritual soul in the true sense of the word, that is to say, an intelligent substance, physically simple, distinct from the body, and independent of the body as to its existence?" After explaining the terms of the definition, the Professor proceeds to inquire whether it would be better to first establish the existence of the soul and then refute the materialistic arguments, or first demolish the arguments of the materialists and then vindicate the existence of the soul. While admitting that each plan has its advantages, our author finally decides to clear away the weeds before planting the good seed. Accordingly, the next three conferences are devoted to a refutation of materialism. The so-called axiom, "no force without matter," and the materialistic arguments based upon the relations between the brain and thought, the conservation of energy, the supposed obscurity of the spiritualistic theory, and the supposed simplicity of materialism are discussed and overthrown. The difficulties being thus removed, in the remaining conferences the proofs of a spiritual soul are presented and developed. The conferences are characterised throughout by lucidity of style, closeness of reasoning, and a thoroughly dispassionate treatment of the subject. Confident in the possession of the truth, M. Ceillier can afford to be more than fair to his opponents. Frequently he presents their difficulties in far greater force than they are commonly presented by the materialists themselves. Indeed he is seen to greater advantage in the destructive rather than the constructive portion of his work. We trust that M. Ceillier will treat us to many more booklets of this kind. If they are worthy successors to the present course of lectures, they will be useful to professors as well as to students and the ordinary reader.

The Physical System of S. Thomas. By Fr. GIOVANNI MARIA CORNOLDI, S.J., translated by EDWARD HENEAGE DERING. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1893. Pp. 228.

AS is well known, the scholastic was the philosophy universally taught in Catholic schools till the period of the so-called Reformation. During the times of unrest and disquiet which followed the outbreak of the Protestant schism the study of philosophy became to a great extent neglected. When society had to some extent recovered from the violent upheaval of the sixteenth century, and philosophy had resumed its position as an integral portion of the ordinary Catholic curriculum, the traditions of scholasticism had largely fallen into oblivion. Other systems, better suited, as was erroneously thought, to the circumstances and needs of the times, were substituted for the doctrines and methods of mediæval philosophy. And so system succeeded system until in our own day the teaching of S. Thomas was restored to its original supremacy by Leo XIII., happily reigning. But, even before the majestic encyclical which reinstated S. Thomas in his position of chief exponent of Christian philosophy had appeared, a small number of distinguished men, of whom the best known were Liberatore, Sanseverino, Kleutgen, and Cornoldi, were labouring earnestly to secure the restoration and the general acceptance of the philosophical doctrines of the Angelical doctor. When they first commenced to lecture and to write, the teaching of S. Thomas was outside of the great Dominican Order which had always remained loyal to its great preceptor, and had not only jealously guarded the best of his writings, but had also in a living and unbroken tradition preserved the sense and the spirit of his words, not only forgotten but also misrepresented and discredited even amongst Catholics. Such, however, was the success of their endeavours that the encyclical "Æterni Patris" was received on its publication not only in the spirit of obedience, but with intelligent appreciation and with joy by the whole Catholic world. The name of Cornoldi, as the name of a member of this band of gallant workers, is one that will be always held in honour by the advocates of sound philosophy. The book under notice is not, however, one that will greatly add to the fame of Fr. Cornoldi. Nevertheless it is in many respects a useful book. The student of philosophy may not find much in it that is new to him, but the general reader will peruse with profit the short and concisely worded chapters which set forth the doctrines of S. Thomas on such important subjects as matter, substantial form, nature, seminal causes, physical laws, motion, substantial transformation, &c. The

translation is occasionally a little stiff and too obviously a translation, but, when due allowance is made for the difficulty of throwing into English scholastic terms and modes of expression, the translation deserves to be reckoned, on the whole, a good one.

Life of S. Edmund of Canterbury, from original sources. By WILFRID WALLACE, D.D., M.A., LL.B., priest of the Order of St. Benedict, of the Beuron Congregation. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Limited. 1893. 8vo, pp. 638.

NOW for the first time we have in English a Catholic life of S. Edmund. That a Saint who looms so largely in the history of this country should have been hitherto thus neglected is surely a reproach to English Catholic literature. Nevertheless, after reading the work which Dr. Wallace has just published, we feel strongly inclined to say, "O felix culpa." We can afford to wait if we are to obtain complete satisfaction in the end; and had Lives of S. Edmund already appeared, perhaps Dr. Wallace would have never undertaken his task. Dr. Wallace informs us that, beyond the devotion to S. Edmund and love for his name, which he shares in common with every genuine son of S. Edmund's College, he had no special qualification for the office of writing the Saint's life, which his religious superior assigned to him. If this be the case, then we can only say, "Vir obediens loquetur victorias," for the Life that Dr. Wallace has given us is the most perfect that we could conceive. It will always be the classical Life of S. Edmund.

The greater portion of the book is, very naturally, devoted to the career of S. Edmund as Archbishop. It was by no choice of his own that Edmund entered upon possession of the See of S. Thomas. The favourite domestic who hastened to his room to acquaint him with the news of his election received small thanks for his pains. "Be off, you booby, about your business," said Edmund, "and mind you shut the door so that no one may come to interrupt my studies." It was only when it was represented to him that his persistent refusal might lead to the election of one through whom the cause of religion might suffer, that the Saint reluctantly gave way. S. Edmund's pontificate was cast in stormy times. But he had an eye to see what the interests of the Church and the welfare of the kingdom demanded, and the courage to insist that it should be accomplished. He gave a proof of his mettle while he was still but Archbishop-elect. He presented a remonstrance to the King, in which he pointed out that Henry was guilty of the gravest injustice in establishing foreigners in the most important positions of the

State, and declared that he would excommunicate any one, no matter who he might be, that stood in the way of reform, or whose conduct was detrimental to the interests of the commonwealth. S. Edmund was the man needed for the time, but not even such a man as he could enter the conflict single-handed and come off the victor. And single-handed for the most part he undoubtedly was. King, barons, and secular power were all arrayed against him as he laboured for reform. But this, after all, was to be expected. The world is ever in opposition to the Church. But what was unexpected, what was the hardest blow of all and the crushing blow, was that he should receive rather hindrance than help from his spiritual brethren. During the six years in which he maintained the unequal conflict he was "persecuted by the bad, misrepresented by the good, supported hardly by any, even of those who were bound by their sacred office to support him." Even the papal legate, Otho, time after time threw all his influence into the scale against him. Finding himself hindered on every side from exercising his pastoral office in accordance with the dictates of his conscience, S. Edmund at length determined to abandon the hopeless struggle, and retired to the Monastery at Pontigny. There, during the few weeks of life which still remained to him, the Saint "abandoned himself without reserve to the unwonted luxury of a life of prayer, recollection, and contemplation undisturbed by external solicitudes," while his austerities "put the cowled monks to the blush, though they followed the strict Cistercian rule." But for the account of his glorious conflict, and of the days of his exile which his love of justice and hatred of iniquity had brought upon him we refer our readers to Dr. Wallace's Life. Truly it is a Life in a higher than the conventional sense of the term, for it makes the Saint to *live* before our eyes, so graphic it is and so sympathetic. We have been much tempted to quote passages from Dr. Wallace's work—passages which display the writer's large historical reading, or his critical sagacity, or his power of description. But why quote from a book which we trust and believe will soon be in the hands of all ?

Reviews in Brief.

The Life of St. Charles Borromeo. Edited by EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. Second edition. London: Burns & Oates. New York, &c. : Benziger Brothers.—A reprint of a popular “Life” of the holy Cardinal of Milan. It is an admirably written volume. We should have been glad, however, to see a few additions; for example, a few more details concerning St. Charles’s relations with this country, and with her confessors and martyrs, and a description of his tomb and incorrupt body.

The Life of St. Dominic. With a Sketch of the Dominican Order. Second edition. London: Burns & Oates.—This is the well-known Life of St. Dominic published many years ago by the writer who, recently, has written the memoirs of the holy Patriarch on a much more ample scale. The re-issue is called a “second edition ;” but, for all that we can see, it is a mere reprint, leaving untouched one or two mistakes which the author has corrected in the longer Life. We cannot be wrong in saying that it has been issued without her sanction. Still, it is an acceptable book, and will be preferred by many to the more ambitious biography.

The Seven Cities of the Dead, and other Poems. By Sir JOHN CROKER BARROW. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1893.—Sir John Barrow, gifted, as he has already shown, with the power of expressing lofty and earnest thought in melodious verse, has ventured, not unworthily, on a solemn theme. The Seven Cities of the Dead are the divisions of a sevenfold purgatory, apportioned to the purification of souls from the guilt of the Deadly Sins, visited in a dream and described in vivid, poetic diction. Among the shorter pieces, the sonnets to Pope Leo XIII., to Cardinal Newman, and to Cardinal Manning and his successor are the most interesting and graceful.

Poems: Dramatic and Democratic. By GASCOIGNE MACKIE. London: Elliott Stock. 1893.—These poems are very unequal in diction, and the introduction of a line of conversational commonplace occasionally jars on the ear in the midst of the author’s most ambitious flights. He seems to us at his best in his simpler lyrics, such as “The Sand Flower” or “A Falling Star,” rather than in more pretentious monologues in blank verse, or in the much-abused metre of “Locksley Hall.”

Le Comtesse de Chambrun. Ses Poesies. Paris: Calmann Levy. 1893.—In this elegant volume Madame de Chambrun's graceful lyrics are prefaced by an interesting memoir of that good and gifted lady. The lines on the passion-flower are the best known of those she has written, for they have not only been translated into several languages, but have served as an inspiration for the musical genius both of Gounod and of Ambroise Thomas, whose settings of them are reproduced in this work. Among the illustrations which add to its interest is a beautiful reproduction in photogravure of Raphael's *Madonna del Gran Duca*, a masterpiece especially dear to the artistic Countess.

God's Birds. By JOHN PRIESTMAN. London: Burns & Oates. 1893.—This interesting volume condenses the result of much study and erudition into a series of short monographs on the various birds alluded to in the Old and New Testaments, with sketches of their habits and characteristics illustrative of the Scriptural context. The "fowls of the air" are a frequent subject of metaphor and figurative allusion in the Bible narrative, and a work like the one before us, which gives added vitality to these passages, should have a fascination for readers of all ages, over and above its useful purpose in elucidating their meaning.

"Tolerari potest." De juridico valore Decreti Tolerantiae commentarius, auctore NICOLAS NILLES, S.J. (Eniponte. Typis et sumptibus Fel. Rauch (C. Pustet). 1893. Pp. 64.—This compendious but very able treatise is divided into three parts. In the first part the author inquires upon the precise significance of tolerance, in the second he explains the nature and force of the "decretem tolerantiae," and in the third he sets forth some authentic rules formulated by Canon Law for the right understanding of the decree of tolerance. The author adduces many instances of tolerances from ancient and modern times, and, as might be expected, gives due prominence to the "decretem tolerantiae" published during the recent school controversy in America.

Le Mystère de N. S. Jésus-Christ. Par Le R. P. J. CORNE, Oblat de Marie Immaculée, Supérieur du Grand Séminaire de Fréjus. Delhomme et Briguet, Éditeurs. Paris: 13 Rue de l'Abbaye. Lyon: 3 Avenue de l'Archevêché. Pp. 903.—This is the first instalment of a work in five volumes projected by the author. What has thus far appeared has met with very warm approval from the Bishop of Fréjus, who declares in a letter, which is prefixed to the first volume, that the author's book reminds him at once of the magnificent work of Mgr. Bougaud, "Le Christianisme et les temps

présent," the profound meditations of Mgr. Gay, and the pious reflections of Coleridge in his "Vita vitæ nostræ." Certainly, from the point of view of devotion Fr. Corne's treatise leaves nothing to be desired. It abounds in pious reflections and ejaculations. But we are not quite so well assured of its depth and solidity, and there can be no question that the author would do well to cultivate a little more the art of compression. What is said here in nine hundred pages might very well have been said in one-fourth of that space.

L'Esprit Humain. C. GREPRO. Paris: Libraires-Imprimeries Réunies, 2 Rue Mignon. 1893. Pp. 72.—We have read some wearisome books in our time, but none so wearisome as this. Macaulay illustrates with an amusing anecdote the utter dreariness of Guicciardini's History. But Guicciardini becomes "Pickwick" when compared with "L'Esprit Humain." The chief characteristic of the author's style is his faculty for the multiplication of words which lead nowhither. The matter of the book, so far as we can form an estimate of it, consists in great part of an elaborate trifling with religion and philosophy, apparently conducted, however, in all seriousness by the author.

Index Rationum ac Doctrinarum quae ex aliis operibus desumuntur Auctoris: "A Discussion with an Infidel" hujus inventa apprime confirmantium. Londoni: "Art and Book Company" et Leamingtoniae. Neo-Eboraci, &c.: Benziger Fratres. 1892. Pp. 46.—There are some things in this pamphlet—e.g., the author's views on the production of the bestial soul—which we consider both unscholastic and untenable. Nevertheless, the pamphlet contains much that is sound and useful. The author has a happy knack of compressing many thoughts into few words. But, to our sorrow, his printer has been stimulated into an unhappy spirit of emulation, and has endeavoured, only too successfully, to compress many words into very little space. Such type as that employed in the "Index Rationum" destroys the sight of youth and scoffs at the sight of age.

An Explanation of the Prayers and Ceremonies of the Mass in Familiar Discourses addressed to a Congregation. By Rev. E. B. GLOVER, O.S.B. London and Leamington: The Art and Book Co.—An admirable little work of 133 pp., costing only sixpence, which should be placed in the hands of uninstructed Catholics, and of non-Catholics instructed in many things, but wholly ignorant of the beauty and holiness of Catholic worship.

Books Received.

Life of Dr. O'Hurley, Archbishop of Cashel. By Dean Kinane, P.P.V.G. 8vo, pp. 108. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

Rome et Ses Monuments. Chanoine de Bleser. 8vo, 535-165. Maps. Louvain: Ch. Fonteyn.

Siege of Derry. Rev. Philip Dwyer. 8vo, pp. 254. London: Elliot Stock.

Hermengild, or Two Crowns: a Tragedy. By Rev. J. Oechtering. 8vo, pp. 60. Notre Dame, Indiana. 25c.

La Visitation au XVII^{ème}. Siècle. Naples, 1680-1694. 8vo, pp. 27. Paris: Firmin Didot.

L'Evangile et l'Apocalypse de Pierre. Par Adolphe Lods. 8vo, pp. 118. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

The Founders of Old Testament Criticism. T. K. Cheyne, D.D. 8vo, pp. 372. London: Methuen & Co. 7s. 6d.

French Jansenists. 8vo, pp. 256. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

British History and Papal Claims. Rev. Jas. Paton. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 505-589. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

The Merry Month and other Pieces. Henry B. Baildon. 8vo, pp. 203. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Selections from Swift. By H. Craik. Vol. ii. 8vo, pp. 488. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ben Johnson. Edited by B. Nicholson, M.D. 8vo, pp. 382. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Mr. Gladstone: "A Life Misspent." London: Simpkin & Co. 8vo, pp. 283.

Life of Mère Marie Thérèse. 8vo, pp. 302. London: Burns & Oates.

John Wycliff. By Lewis Sergeant. 8vo, pp. 371. London: G. Putnam's Sons.

Manual of the Holy Family. Rev. B. Hammer, O.S.F. 12mo, pp. 524. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Parochi Vade-mecum. 12mo, pp. 60. London & Leamington: Art & Book Co.

Spiritual Combat and Peace of the Soul. 12mo, pp. 180. London & Leamington: Art & Book Co.

Thomas Cranmer. J. R. Willington, M.A. Pp. 44. London & Leamington: Art & Book Co.

The Flight into Egypt. George Richardson. London: Burns & Oates.

Imitation of Christ. 12mo, pp. 323. London & Leamington: Art & Book Co.

Manuale Sacerdotum. P. Jos. Schneider. 13^a editio. Curâ A. Lehmkuhl. 12mo, pp. 658. Cologne: J. P. Bachem.

Godfrey, the Little Hermit, and other Tales. Canon Schmid. 8vo, pp. 310. London & Leamington: Art & Book Co.

The Hidden Treasure. St. Leonard, of Port Maurice. 12mo pp. 56. Art & Book Co.

Apples Ripe and Rosy, Sir. Mary C. Crowley. 8vo, pp. 256. Nôtre Dame, Ind.

Witness of the Saints. Rev. H. S. Bowden. 8vo, pp. 94. London: Burns & Oates.

Life Everlasting. The Bishop of Newport & Menevia. 8vo, pp. 26. London: Art & Book Co.

Religious Problems of the Nineteenth Century. By Aubrey de Vere. 8vo, pp. 232. London: St. Anselm's Society.

The Primer of Church Latin. By R. F. Conder, B.A. 8vo, pp. 111. London: Burns & Oates.

The Life of Augustus H. Law, S.J. By Ellis Schreiber. 8vo, pp. 381. London: Burns & Oates.

Five o'Clock Stories. 8vo, pp. 318. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Bros.

National Railways. By James Hole. 8vo, pp. 385. London: Cassell & Co.

The Two Countesses. By Maria Ebner Von Escherbach. Translated by Mrs. Waugh. 8vo, pp. 190. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Memorials of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis. By Edward Bellasis. 8vo, pp. 211. London: Burns & Oates. 10s. 6d.

Tennyson's Life and Poetry. By Eugene Parsons. pp. 30. Chicago. 2nd Edition. 1s.

Jean Bréhal, Grand Inquisiteur de la France, et la réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc. Par le R. P. Belon et le R. P. Balme. Grand 8vo, pp. 152-208-188. Paris: Lethielleux et Cie. 15frs.

La Question Ouvrière. Par L'Abbé Feret. 8vo, pp. 382. Paris: Lethielleux. 7frs. 50c.

El Nuevo Mondo: a Poem. By Louis J. Block. 8vo, pp. 95. Chicago: Cl. Kerr & Co.

Inspiration, and other Lectures. By F. Rooke. 8vo, pp. 261. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

The Life of Father Charles. Rev. Fr. Austen, C.P. 8vo, pp. 229. Dublin: Lealy, Bryers & Walker. London: Simpkin & Marshall.

La Vénérable Mère Julianne Morell. Par le R. P. Matthieu J. Rousset, O.P. 8vo, pp. 304. Paris: Delhomme et Briguet.

Avis et Réflexions sur les devoirs de l'état religieux. Par un religieux Bénédictin. 8vo, pp. 308. Paris: Hippolyte Walzer.

La dévotion au Sacré Cœur de Jésus. Par C. R. P. Terrien, S.J. 8vo, pp. 375. Paris: Lethielleux.

La Confession. Rev. P. Félix, S.J. 2me édition. 8vo, pp. 330. Paris: Téqui.

Le Pape, les Catholiques, et la Question Sociale. Par Leon Grégoire. 8vo, pp. 264. Paris: Perrin et Cie.

Le Comte Joseph de Maistre et sa famille. Par M. de l'Escure. 8vo, pp. 442. Paris: H. Chapelliez et Cie.

History of Elections in the American Colonies. By C. F. Bishop. 8vo, pp. 295. New York: Columbia College.

The Financial History of Virginia. By W. Z. Ripley. 8vo, pp. 170. New York: Columbia College.

The Inheritance Tax. By Max West. 8vo, pp. 140. New York: Columbia College.

La Population. Edouard Van der Smissen. 8vo, pp. 561. Paris: Guillaumin et Cie.

L'Âme Sainte. D. Gabriel-Marie Falconis, traduit par M. l'Abbé Fourot. 3me édition. 8vo. pp. 722. Montreuil-sur-Mer : Imprimerie Nôtre Dame du Près.

Entrétiens de Jésus Christ avec l'Âme Fidele. J. J. Lansperge. 8vo, pp. 250. Nouvelle édition. Montreuil-sur-Mer : Imp. Nôtre Dame du Près.

Dieu y pourvoira. Large 8vo, pp. 260. Grammont, Lille : Librairie de St. Charles.

Le Courage Chrétien. Large 8vo, pp. 276. Grammont, Lille : Librairie de St. Charles.

Histoire du bon Larron. Mgr. Gaume. 8vo, pp. 296. Paris : P. Gaume et Cie.

Les Joies du Pardon. Large 8vo, pp. 258. Grammont : Œuvre de St. Charles Borromée.

Les Femmes Chrétiennes. 8vo, pp. 252. Montreuil-sur-Mer : Imprimerie Nôtre Dame du Près.

Les Vièrges Chrétiennes. 8vo, pp. 275. Montreuil-sur-Mer : Imprimerie Nôtre Dame du Près.

Les Héros Chrétiens. 8vo. pp. 232. Montreuil-sur-Mer : Imprimerie Nôtre Dame du Près.

Les Recréations Poétiques. C. R. P. Marc. 8vo, pp. 128. Paris : Delhomme et Briguet.

Le Cardinal Manning et son Action Sociale. Par l'Abbé Jemire. 8vo, pp. 286. Paris : Victor Lecoffre.

Diocesan Seminaries. Rev F. A. Bourne. 8vo, pp. 66. London : Burns & Oates.

Le Zèle Sacerdotale. C. R. P. de Laage, S.J. 8vo, pp. 240. Paris : Téqui.

Special Assessments. Victor Rosewater. 8vo. pp. 152. New York : Columbia College.

Méditations sur les Sept Paroles de N. S. Jésus Christ en Croix. L'Abbé Charles Perraud. 8vo. pp. 276. Paris : H. Chapellier.

An Architect in Exile. B. Whelan. 8vo, pp. 110. London : Burns & Oates.

Le Paradis terrestre et la Race Nègre devant la Science. L'Abbé Dessailly. 8vo, pp. 320. Paris : Delhomme et Briguet.

Vie de P. Ludovic de Cassoria. L'Abbé M. Le Monnier. 8vo, pp. 267. Paris : Perren et Cie.

Direction de Conscience. Traduit de l'Italien par l'Abbé Gautier. 8vo, pp. 174. Paris : Téqui.

Vie de Sainte Claire de la Croix. Lorenza Tardi. 8vo, pp. 279. Paris : Téqui.

The Economics of a Russian Village. Isaac Hourwich. 8vo, pp. 172. New York : Columbia College.

Le Duc de Lauzun et la Cour intime de Louis XV. Gaston Maugras. 8vo, pp. 463. Paris : Plon, Nourrit et Cie.

Hunolt's Sermons. Vols. IX. and X. 8vo, pp. 483-536. London : Burns & Oates ; New York : Benziger Bros.

Modern Errors against the Destiny of Man and Papal Infallibility. Rev L. J. Miller. 8vo, pp. 399. Indiana, South Bend : Tribune Printing Co.

Studi de Scienza Sociale. Antonio Mollière, traduit da Giuseppe Pira. 8vo, pp. 680. Torens : Marietti.

Prison Life of Marie Antoinette. By M. C. Bishop. 8vo, pp. 312. London : Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co.

I N D E X.

JULY—OCTOBER, 1893.

ALCOHOL, How to deal with, 660.
l'Allemagne et la Réforme, vol. iii., *noticed*, 947.
Amherst, Rev. W., 515, 858.
Ang-Kor, Ancient Remains of, 930.
Anglican Orders, Rome's Tribute to, 766.
Anselme, l'Argument de St., *noticed*, 979.
Apologetics, or Christianity Defensively Stated, *noticed*, 702, 940.
Apology, A Christian, *noticed*, 703.
Apostolische Glaubenbekenntnis, Das, *noticed*, 967.
Archbold, W. A. J., 721.
Argument de St. Anselme, l', *noticed*, 979.
Artificial Clouds, 654.
Australia, New Route to, 672.

BACON, François, *noticed*, 718.
Baeumer, P. Guithbert, 967.
Barine, A., 719.
Basile, Giambattesta, 961.
Bernardin de S. Pierre, *noticed*, 719.
Bible, Dictionnaire de la, *noticed*, 696.
Biographies by Mrs. Hope, *noticed*, 944.
Blessed Virgin in the Fathers of the First Six Centuries, *noticed*, 942.
Branchereau, L., Méditations, 946.
Braunsberger, Otto, 683.
Breen, Rev. J. D., 766.
Breviary Romanum, *noticed*, 950.
Brownson, H. F., 686.
Brownson, Literary, Scientific, and Political Views of, *noticed*, 686.
Bruce, Professor, 702, 940.
Busson, l'Abbé, 976.
Butler, Dom Cuthbert, 497, 836.
Byrne, Rev. W., 975.

CABRINI, Rev. Fr., 970.
Cabrol, R. P. Fernand, 756.
Caddell, Cecilia Mary, 966.
Cambridge, Historical Essays, *noticed*, 721.

Carmina Mariana, *noticed*, 688.
Catherine II. of Russia, 733.
Catholic Doctrine of Faith and Morals, *noticed*, 975.
Cellier, l'Abbé H., 981.
Century Dictionary, *noticed*, 943.
Ceremonies of Ordination, *noticed*, 975.
Chambrun, La Comtesse de, *noticed*, 986.
Champney, A. C., 693.
Chaptal, le Comte, 699.
Charles Borromeo, Life of St., *noticed*, 985.
Charles, R. H., 977.
Child, Countess, *noticed*, 756.
Christian Social Union, 659.
Chronology of Books of Esdras and Nehemias, 936.
Clouds, Artificial, 654.
Comte, Auguste, *noticed*, 721.
Congo, Exploration of, 671.
Convict Population, 669.
Cornoldi, Fr. G. M., 982.
Craik, H., 730.
Crosses, Early English, 549.
Crucistationes, 732.
Curtis, Life of Father John, *noticed*, 950.

DANKÓ, Jos., 681.
Dead Return ? Do the, *noticed*, 735.
Defender of the Faith, *noticed*, 737.
Dictionary, Catholic, *noticed*, 714.
Dominic, Life of St., *noticed*, 985.
Driver, Dr., 724.
Dry Period, The Recent Abnormal, 921.
Duration of Electric Spark, 915.
Dybowski, Jean, 963.

EASTERN Solitaries and Holy Communion, 938.
Economics, Weak Point of Church of England, 661.
Edmund of Canterbury, Life of St., *noticed*, 983.
Egypt, Exploration in, 674.
Electric Railways, 917.
Elizabeth's Intrigues, Queen, 599.
Enchiridion ad Sacrarum Disciplinarum Cultores Accomodatum, *noticed*, 735.
English, History of, *noticed*, 693.
Enigma, The Great, *noticed*, 715.
Enoch, The Book of, by R. H. Charles, *noticed*, 977.
Eskimos of Greenland, 677.
Esprit Humain, l', C. Greppo, *noticed*, 987.
Ethics, Evolution and, 589.
Ethics, Principles of, by Herbert Spencer, *noticed*, 970.
Etienne X., Histoire du Pape, *noticed*, 720.

Etudes Réligieuses, 677.
Eucharistic Congress at Jerusalem, 874.
Euringer, Sebastian, 952.
Evolution and Ethics, 589.
Explanation of Prayers and Ceremonies of the Mass. Rev. E. B. Glover, *noticed*, 987.

FELBERMANN, Louis, 731.
Fillion, L'Abbé, 948.
Finnish Legends, *noticed*, 961.
Fire-damp Indicator, 652.
Fonsegrive, G. L., 718.
Foregleams of Christianity, *noticed*, 690.
Fouard, Abbé, 689, 722.

GALLICAN Liturgy, Early, 564.
Gasquet, Rev. F. A., 886.
Gentleman, A., *noticed*, 736.
Geschichte des Alten Testaments, von Dr. E. Schöpfer, *noticed*, 969.
Gilgit Road, 927.
God's Birds, by John Priestman, *noticed*, 986.
Grasilier, Léonce, 960.
Greenland, American Exploration of, 665.
Gruber, le R. P., 721.
Gutberlet, Dr., 964.

HALPIN, Rev. J., 801.
Happy Valley, Scenery of, 928.
de Harlez, Professor, 741.
Herbert, the Lady, 874.
Heurck, Dr. Van, 697.
Histoire de mon Temps, *noticed*, 958.
Histoire du R. P. Cloriviére, *noticed*, 960.
Historisch-politische Blätter, 676, 934.
Holy Family Manual, 732.
Honnête avant tout, *noticed*, 961.
Hope, Biographies by Mrs., *noticed*, 944.
Huguenots, Elizabeth's Intrigues with, 599.
Hungary and its People, *noticed*, 731.
Hunza-Nagar Confederacy, 927.
Hurter, H. S. J., 681.
Hydrophone, the, 920.
Hymnarium Eccles. Hungariae, Vetus, *noticed*, 681.

INDEX Rationum et Doctrinarum, *noticed*, 987.
Instruction in England during thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Religious, 886.
Instructions et Conseils aux Filles Domestiques, *noticed*, 976.
Introduction à la Vie Spirituelle, *noticed*, 945.
Islam, the Propagation of, 741.

JANSSEN, Ein Lebensbild, &c., *noticed*, 728.
Janssen, Geschichte des deutschen Volkes, Fünfter Band, *noticed*, 682.
Janssens, Jean, 947.
Jerusalem, Eucharistic Congress at, 874.

KASHMIR, Agriculture in, 673.
Kashmir, the Land System of, 923.
Kashmirian Tibet, 925.
Katechismen des Seligen P. Canisius, *noticed*, 683.
Katholik, 933.
Kingsley as an Economist, Charles, 662.
Klein, Rev. Dr., 587.

LANDRIEUX, L'Adjutant-Général, *noticed*, 960.
Langdale, Hon. Charles, 515, 858.
Lantern Stereoscope, 917.
Lehre von den heiligen Sacramenten, *noticed*, 729.
Lightfoot, Bishop, and the Early Roman See, 497.
Lilly, W. S., 715.
Levins, Rev. T., 942.
Lucas, Rev. H., 564, 959.

MAGIC Mirrors, Japanese, 655.
Maglione, Canon, 711.
Marie Bonneau de Miramion, *noticed*, 966.
Marie, la Vierge, par Mgr. Richard, *noticed*, 974.
Marriage Process in the United States, *noticed*, 691.
Mary, Saturday Dedicated to, *noticed*, 970.
Martin, Eugene, 684.
Masenius, Rev. J., 945.
Massorah Text des Koheleths, *noticed*, 952.
Méditations, par L. Branchereau, *noticed*, 946.
Mekong, the, 931.
Microscope, the, *noticed*, 697.
Mixed Marriage, *noticed*, 736.
Monastic and Hermitical Life, 937.
Monfat, R. P., 962.
Mystère de N. S. Jésus Christ, par le R. P. J. Corne, *noticed*, 986.

NAPOLÉON et Alexandre I^{er}, *noticed*, 726.
Napoléon, Mes Souvenirs sur, *noticed*, 699.
Ney, le Maréchal, *noticed*, 701.
Nomenclator Litterarius recentioris Theologiæ Catholicæ, Tom. II., *noticed*, 681.

O'LEARY, Rev. P., 975.
Oliphant, Mrs. and F. R., 695.
Oresteia of Æschylus, *noticed*, 735.

PANAMA, Précis historique de l'affaire du, *noticed*, 959.
Pasquier, Mémoires du Chancelier, 958.

Pastor, Lud, 682, 728.
Paul, St., les Missions, 722.
Paul the Hermit and Chronology of Metaphrastes, 936.
Peacock, Miss Florence, 549.
Peary, Lieut., Expedition, 666.
Pentamerone, *noticed*, 961.
Peter and the First Years of Christianity, St., *noticed*, 689.
Physical System of St. Thomas, the, *noticed*, 982.
Pitra, Histoire du Cardinal, *noticed*, 956.
Platinum, Consumption and Sources of, 656.
Poems, Dramatic and Domestic, by Gascoigne Mackie, *noticed*, 985.
Pont-à-Mousson, L'Université de, *noticed*, 684.
Primitive Saints and See of Rome, 626.
Problème Spiritualiste, le, par l'Abbé H. Cellier, *noticed*, 981.
Propagation of Islam, 741.
Psaumes Commentés d'après la Vulgate et l'Hébreu, *noticed*, 948.

RAGEY, R. P., 979.
Ramsay, W. H., 687.
Raoul de Bérignan, *noticed*, 737.
Religious Instruction in England during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, 886.
Resuscitation by Oxygen, 651.
Review of Social Science, New Italian, 658.
Revue des Questions Historiques, 680.
Revue du Monde Catholique, 680.
Ribet, M. I., 961.
Richard, Mgr., 974.
Rivind, R., 961.
Rivington, Rev. Luke, 626.
Roman Empire, the Church and the, *noticed*, 687.
Roman See, Bishop Lightfoot and the Early, 836.
Rome, Primitive Saints and See of, 626.
Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders, 766.
Route du Tchad, La, *noticed*, 963.

SAGHALIEN, 668.
Saturday Dedicated to Mary, *noticed*, 970.
Scannell, Rev. T. B., 714.
Schanz, Paul, 729.
Schöpfer, Dr. E., 969.
Scott, Charles Newton, 690.
Sermons on Old Testament, *noticed*, 724.
Seven Cities of the Dead, by Sir John Croker Barrow, *noticed*, 985.
Shipley, Orby, 688.
Siam, Great Lake of, 927.
Siamese Temples, 932.
Silchester, Ancient Church, 733.
Smith, Rev. S. B., 691.
Somerset Religious Houses, *noticed*, 721.

Soudan, the French, 670.

Sound and Music, *noticed*, 698.

Spencer, Herbert, 970.

Stimmen aus Maria Laach, 935.

Stone, Miss J. M., 599.

Swift, Selections from, *noticed*, 730.

TEMPERANCE and the Social Question, 801.

Terrien, R. P., 960.

Tibetan Piety, 926.

“Tolerari Potest,” by Rev. N. Nilles, S.J., *noticed*, 986.

Tonga et le R. P. Chevron, les, *noticed*, 962.

Tune Book, Catholic, *noticed*, 734.

UGANDA, Commercial Future of, 670.

Université Catholique, L', 677.

VANDAL, A., 726.

Vatican and the Kingdom of Italy, *noticed*, 711.

Vendée, Story of War in La, *noticed*, 737.

Victorian Age of English Literature, *noticed*, 694.

Vierge, Marie la, par Mgr. Richard, *noticed*, 974.

Virgin, in the Fathers of the First Six Centuries, The Blessed, *noticed*, 942.

WALLACE, D.D., Rev. Wilfrid, 983.

Wantage and his Work, Lord, 659.

Welschinger, Henry, 701.

Willensfreiheit und ihre Gegner, Die, *noticed*, 964.

Words of Wisdom from the Scriptures, *noticed*, 949.

ZAHN, Rev. J. A., 698.

Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 676.



Does Not Circulate

AP 4 .D8 SMC

The Dublin review.

AIP-2395 (awab)



